

DA 27

Jesus of Nazareth

NOT THE

Quakers Messiah,

But their Jesus is another false and
feigned Jesus:

OR,

A Rejoinder to a Book, entituled, *The Testimony of the
Hartford Quakers for the Man Christ Jesus vindicated.*

WHEREIN

Is demonstrated, that according to their Faith Jesus Christ is not
now a true and real Man in Heaven, but an ubiquitary Principle
or Quality in every Man: notwithstanding all their good
Words and fair Speeches to the contrary in that Book, they
are found to be meer Juglers and Deceivers of the People.

By *WILL. HAWORTH.*

Matth. 13. 55, 56, 57. *Is not this the Carpenters son? Is not his Mother called
Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And
his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then had this Man all these
things? And they were offended in him.*

Matth. 24. 23, 24. *Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or
there: believe it not, for there shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets.*

Matth. 21. 44. *And whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken: but on
whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to Powder.*

Printed for Jonathan Robinson, at the Golden-Lyon in St. Pauls
Church-yard. 1677.

Quakers Meeting

and a full list of children, and
a full list of names.

1. *Chamaecrista* *...*
 2. *...*
 3. *...*
 4. *...*
 5. *...*
 6. *...*
 7. *...*
 8. *...*
 9. *...*
 10. *...*
 11. *...*
 12. *...*
 13. *...*
 14. *...*
 15. *...*
 16. *...*
 17. *...*
 18. *...*
 19. *...*
 20. *...*
 21. *...*
 22. *...*
 23. *...*
 24. *...*
 25. *...*
 26. *...*
 27. *...*
 28. *...*
 29. *...*
 30. *...*
 31. *...*
 32. *...*
 33. *...*
 34. *...*
 35. *...*
 36. *...*
 37. *...*
 38. *...*
 39. *...*
 40. *...*
 41. *...*
 42. *...*
 43. *...*
 44. *...*
 45. *...*
 46. *...*
 47. *...*
 48. *...*
 49. *...*
 50. *...*
 51. *...*
 52. *...*
 53. *...*
 54. *...*
 55. *...*
 56. *...*
 57. *...*
 58. *...*
 59. *...*
 60. *...*
 61. *...*
 62. *...*
 63. *...*
 64. *...*
 65. *...*
 66. *...*
 67. *...*
 68. *...*
 69. *...*
 70. *...*
 71. *...*
 72. *...*
 73. *...*
 74. *...*
 75. *...*
 76. *...*
 77. *...*
 78. *...*
 79. *...*
 80. *...*
 81. *...*
 82. *...*
 83. *...*
 84. *...*
 85. *...*
 86. *...*
 87. *...*
 88. *...*
 89. *...*
 90. *...*
 91. *...*
 92. *...*
 93. *...*
 94. *...*
 95. *...*
 96. *...*
 97. *...*
 98. *...*
 99. *...*
 100. *...*

W. E. B. DUBOIS

The first of these is the fact that the
 government has been unable to raise the
 necessary funds to carry out its
 policy of non-interference. This
 has been due to a number of factors,
 including the fact that the government
 has been unable to raise the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy of non-
 interference. This has been due to a
 number of factors, including the fact
 that the government has been unable to
 raise the necessary funds to carry out
 its policy of non-interference.



An Answer to the Introduction.

Pag. 3. There is a repetition of what they confess to in their former Book, but let the Reader take notice that there is not a word of the second Local (which we call the Personal) coming of Christ to Judgment, only they testify to his coming in Power and Spirit, which was 1600 years ago.

This second Local coming they are all against, and let the Reader judge if this be not ground sufficient for a shrewd suspicion, that they do not believe Jesus to be a real Man in the Heavens, while they give testimony unto him: for this is one main end of his manifestation in the Flesh, being made Man, viz. to judge the World in his second Local coming from Heaven, read *Acts 17. 31.*

Pag. *ibid.* Speaking of me, they say, *I limit the Spirit of Christ to a wonderful distance from his Saints and Members upon Earth.*

Reply. This a notorious falshood, as you will see by their own words, a little farther, They say I confess to the spiritual presence of Christ.

In Pag. 4. of this Book, I have made that distinction which they do not, neither will allow of (as I can perceive,) viz. 1. The Spirit of Christ's Manhood, that is the same with his Soul, a Creature and cannot be in two places at once, much less as the *Quakers* would have it, in all the Saints. 2. The Spirit of the Godhead. This is no Creature, but God by Nature, and may be in all the Saints: *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, Rom. 8. 9.*

Let the Reader remember this distinction and he may answer a great part of their Cavils in this Book, and see the absurdity of their Opinion, viz. Of the Soul of Christ being in every Saint.

Pag. 4. They would make the Reader believe that I contradict my self, in that I will not admit the soul of Christ to extend to the

Saints on Earth, yet say, that the Deity and Humanity is in union, and acts with or together, and they must not be put asunder.

Reply. Whoever writ this Book he hath a notable faculty of finding out Contradictions where there are none; had he as good a faculty at an Argument, we should have more ado with him. There is much said of this you will find up and down this Book over and over: I will reply to it more fully when I meet with it again in a more convenient place, only take this for the present, We believe that Christ hath two Natures, Divine and Humane in personal Union, yet these two Natures are not to be confounded or changed one into another, but their Essences and essential Properties are to be kept distinct. This might serve for an answer to their whole Book, which is nothing but a meer cavil for want of admitting that distinction: Reader remember this.

Pag. 4. Lin. 13. They put this question, *Where proves be that the Son of God is a finite Creature?*

Reply. This fallacy you shall find often in the body of the Book: We never said that the Son of God (considered as the Son of God) was a Creature, but this Son of God who is God by Nature hath taken a Creature, viz. a Humane Soul and Body into personal union with himself, and he is Mediator as to both Natures: If any of us do say so (as some have,) viz. The Creator was and is a Creature, it is by a figure, attributing that which is proper only to the Humane Nature to the Person that is denominated by the other Nature. Mark this Reader, because we shall have frequent occasion given before we get to the end to make use of the same.

Pag. ibid. Lin. 18. They bring two Scriptures to prove the Soul of Christ to be in the Saints, *Rom. 8. 9. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Gal. 4. 6. God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts, &c.*

Reply. Are these two Scriptures to be understood of the Soul of Christ an essential part of the Manhood?

Pag. 4. Lin. 27. They say they stand for this way and method of Salvation thorow the Son, adding, *no man cometh to the Father but by the Son.*

Reply. The Son of God hath now two distinct Natures in one Person; stand for him so or else you stand not for the right Mediator.

Towards the latter end of the *fourth Page* they tax me with confused rambling, and with varying from, and confounding Scripture language, and say, I am proved a Forger in the business of the *Barbican dispute*.

Reply. Whether I have confusedly rambled, I leave to the impartial Reader. Those *Quakers* are Parties, and not fit to be Judges. As to the other, how can I be proved a Forger, who in this thing am but of the same mind with all those that were at that Dispute, that were not *Quakers*, or leavened with *Quakerism*, they are all of the same mind, *viz.* That the *Quakers* at the *Barbican Meeting* did deny the Manhood of Christ as stated by the Protestant Church, and you do still deny it: Those that do not preserve the essential properties of the Manhood destroy it: but the *Quakers* do not, as appears both by their last, and likewise by this Book.

Last of all in that Page, They mention *Will. Bates*, and the *Certificate*, signed by the three Neighbours.

Reply. Let the Reader take notice that I have made good my Charge against *Will. Bates*, and whereas the *Hartford Quakers* in their last, said, that I had not rightly stated the Matter, it appears now that I have by his own confession.

And though they would in *Pag. 5.* make some words, yet the Reader seeth there is no material difference in my two Relations of his words, it is so small and inconsiderable that the Reader cannot but smile in the reciting of it.

They say in this *fifth Page*, that *Will. Bates* spoke *unadvisedly*.

Reply. The *Quakers* for most-part both speak and write unadvisedly in matters of Divinity: we should be glad if they were all humble enough to acknowledge it as this Man hath done, though what this Mans confession amounts to, you will see anon.

A little lower in the Page, they say, He was ensnared by the Priest's craft.

Reply. They cannot call me Priest in any proper language, only their malice here runs over: I never pretended to the offering up of any real Sacrifice, as the Papists in their Mass, let the name be to whom it is due, but what word I should affix to the *Quakers* Ministers I know not. Priests they cannot be called, for they lay no claim or relation to Christ as a real Sacrifice of Atonement to Justice for Sin, nor to any Ordinance representing it, but scoff at them, and its most probable calls us Priests in derision, because we exercise ourselves in the things of Christ, which shew forth

his death as a sacrifice of Attonement ; therefore they must be called *Flamins*, the name the Heathenish Ministers had that pretended to high Raptures and Revelations.

As to the Craft they accuse me with in the management of the Discourse, I have the same three Witnesses that are ready to testify of my plainness and simplicity therein, *I called Will. Bates a Prophet of their own, in this they disown him as none of their Ministry.*

Ans. It is enough that they own him as a *Quaker*, we thought they had all been Prophets according to their first Opinion, all guided by an infallible Spirit.

Again, they say, *they have confessed to the same Christ Jesus, and owned Jesus of Nazareth, and it is not fair that for one I should condemn all.*

Reply. To little purpose is it to confess in some words at one time, and afterwards to deny it in other words. I have firmly proved that the *Quakers* deny Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah in my *Animad. Pag. 6.* and it is not yet taken off, but remains, and they have confirmed it by what is spoken in this last Book, as will appear in the Progress.

Do not they deny Jesus of Nazareth, that say the Body that was taken of the Virgin is changed as to substance, and the Humane Soul is in every Saint ?

Neither Soul nor Body are in Being according to this opinion.

Where then is Jesus that was called so, as being born of the Virgin, and dwelling at Nazareth ? I challenge them all to answer this Argument, and know they cannot, unless they will retract what they have unadvisedly written : I do not blame all for one, but how should we know the *Quakers* Opinion but by conversing with them, and hearing their Opinions from their own Mouths, unless they would have us come to their Meetings to hear them preach, which indeed I have done frequently, and have heard enough and too much, till I have heard both the Godhead and the Manhood of Christ denied. *J. Crook*, in my hearing, denied the Godhead, in saying, *The only begotten Son of God, begotten within us* : Another at *Bull and Mouth*, I have heard deny the Manhood, in saying, *God manifested in the Flesh*, clapping his Hand on his Breast, this Flesh. It's taken for granted by all the Godly that know you, that all of you that are right *Quakers* deny the real Manhood of Christ taken of the Virgin to have any Being ; and if you would honestly come off, confess plainly to that last

Proposition

Proposition in so many words, which yet you have not done. In that I say they are not all guided by one and the same infallible Light, they conclude from hence that some of them must needs be, and then a shame to me to censure them as Cheaters.

Reply. I think it's plain that I spake those words as to the proud conceit of themselves, not as to my opinion of them.

They call upon me in the close of this their Introduction to cite their Books, where I have read these words, viz. That what was taken of the Virgin had now no Being, and concludes with many hard and bitter words.

Reply. I did read the thing (and so many others) in that Book called the Testimony of the Hartford Quakers, and it is plain as the Noon light to all whose eyes are not utterly bored out, that he that saith the Humane Body is changed as to the Substance, and the Humane Soul so infinit, that it is in many Millions, Miriads of places at once, viz. in all Saints, hath not left a Dram or Scruple of Jesus of Nazareth, that which was taken of the Virgin in Being. Give me this under your hands, that all whatever the Son of God took of the Substance of the Body of the Virgin Mary, Joseph's espoused Wife, hath now a real distinct Being, and is not so changed but remains for Substance the same. All its essential Properties are preserved, and then we shall have better thoughts of you, if withall you do but think that any thing at all was taken of the Virgin; for I begin to be jealous of you by some things that you have let fall in this your last Book. As to the last insinuating threatenng, I leave my self in the hands of Jesus Christ, only take notice, that whoever opposeth their Error, this is their way of dealing with them.

A Reply to the second Part of the Book, viz. A Collection of Doctrines, about which (as they say) the Controversy between me and the Quakers depend.

1. **O**F the Body of Christ in Heaven, that it is a Humane natural Body, and in the next Paragraph saith, This is in contradiction to what I say, that it is a very glorious Body.

Reply. I call it a Natural Body and Earthly as to Substance, it must have that which is essential to it, though I have granted it is supernaturally changed as to qualities. The contradiction (as they call it) is answered in Pag. 16. of the *Animadversions*, and these Men took no notice of it, they would want Matter to fill up if they should not take this course.

2. **D**oct. 3. That Stephen saw Christ Jesus with his carnal eye.

Reply. I speak this by that figure of the communication of Properties: That which is proper only to one nature, is attributed to the whole Person denominated by that nature. I ask the *Quakers* how it can be said that Christ died? It was only as to his Humanity, not Deity, this answers that cavil. All that I find in the fourth Doctrine is but the same we had in their Introduction, and there it is answered by that distinction of the Spirit of the Manhood, and the Spirit of the Godhead.

Pag. 7. Before we come at the fifth Doctrine, Lin. 6. They tell us the controversy would be at an end if I was but real in my confession to the spiritual presence of Christ.

Reply. I am hearty and real with all my soul, that Jesus Christ is present with all his Saints in Heaven and Earth, as to the Deity of the Son, and by the Spirit who is God which proceeds from the Son, and therefore call'd the Spirit of the Son acting always in and towards the Saints, in reference to the Son of God. Now let the *Quakers* as really consent to this, viz. That when you speak of the Man Christ being in Heaven, you understand all the Essential Properties that he had as Man when on Earth, and there is I will grant a fair end of the controversy, and I will write no more

more about it, in case you do withall but say that the Manhood Christ had on Earth was like to ours in all things, Sin excepted.

Doct. 5. Concerning Infants being Innocents.

Reply. They do not yet engage in this controversy, it is left to C. Tayler to manage. I will stay till his Book come, then it may be very easie to demonstrate the truth, and that these five Scriptures which they name are nothing to the purpose.

What they say as to the sixth Doctrine, pray read my *Animadversions* over again, Pag. 21, 22.

There is sufficient written and no notice taken of it, nor a word of answer. At this rate we may write *ad infinitum*. The *Quakers* did not need to write another Book, but only have printed the same Book over again, for hitherto you see the same things are insisted on over again.

But before I leave that sixth Head, there is one of the *Quakers* sly Queries, viz. *Whether the Gentiles are children of Wrath by the work of the Law in their Hearts?*

Reply. They were children of Wrath by the guilt of the first sin of *Adam* imputed to them, they being all in his Loins, *Rom. 5. 18. in whom all have sinned.* Thus they are by nature children of Wrath, *Eph. 2. 2.* Now, notwithstanding the work of the Law is written in their hearts, and they in this state do somethings contained in the Law; yet acting all, they act only from this unregenerate principle of the work of the Law in their hearts, neither to a right end, viz. the glory of God. They did by all their actions, and do by all but render themselves more the children of Wrath, and incur the greater condemnation.

There is a Scripture brought under this Query, *Psal. 19. 7. As if there was conversion by the Law, either written in the heart of Men, or in the Decalogue.*

Reply. By the Law there is to be understood all the Writings of the Old and New Testament, and in them is included the Word of the Gospel, by which alone Conversion is wrought, not by the Law strictly taken, *Gal. 3. 2.*

In the last Query, Pag. 7. *Could it be corrupt sinful Nature by which those Gentiles mentioned, Rom. 2. 14, 15. did those things contained in the Law, and were justified?*

Reply. Here is a gross lye, slyly insinuated, as if the Gentiles spoke of *Rom. 2. 14, 15.* were at that time, and in that state and condition, and by that principle by which they then acted, justified

fied, because the Apostle in Chap. 3. Vers. 24. speaks of Justification, this is certainly to corrupt the Word. I see a deal of the subtlety of the Serpent in these Men, those Gentiles that were afterwards justified, were justified thorow Faith in the blood of Christ, Rom. 3. 24. Now the Law is not of Faith, Gal. 3. 12.

To the eighth Doctrine. That we must not admit any thing, no not so much as our Faith into that Righteousness whereby we are justified in God's sight. They oppose Rom. 5. 1. being justified by Faith.

Reply. Faith is taken objectively, for the thing that Faith receives, which is the Personal Righteousness of Christ, and therefore called the Righteousness which is [through Faith,] Phil. 3. 9. [The Righteousness which is of God by Faith.] Faith is the Instrument that receives it, to speak otherwise is Popish Doctrine.

Doct. 9. Is the doctrine of Perfection spoken of?

Reply. I do plainly say there is no sinless Perfection in this Life, and am ready to draw the Saw of Dispute with the Quakers in this Matter when they please. The Quakers have been silent as to this Matter a long while, I was in hope that by this time they had been utterly ashamed of such a ridiculous Opinion: That which they bring in from my self against my self, is my mentioning God's renewing of our nature, and God's perfecting all good in us, as if there could be no renewings without perfection in degree: We are but renewed in part in this Life. This work is perfect as to kind, but not as to degree; that Perfection as to degree, we look for in transitu, and is not wrought before. Those Scriptures that are brought for Perfection are to be understood as to the power and dominion of Sin, so we are freed here upon Conversion, not as to the indwelling of Sin that continues all our days.

Doct. 10. They tell you James is for Justification by works, Jam. 2. 21, 24. and makes no distinction at all, but leaves the Scripture to fight with it self, as if Paul and James did contradict one another.

Whereas it's plain there is a harmony betwixt them, Paul speaking of Justification in God's sight, the other in Man's sight, read Rom. 4. 11, and you will see there is a plain contradiction of the blessed Apostle Paul in making use of that Scripture, Psal. 32. 2. Paul went to prove that we are justified in God's sight without works, he proves it from Psal. 32. 1. and vers. 2. Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, &c. Now the Quakers say that what Paul saith in Rom. 4. 6. is contrary to what David saith in Psal.

Pfal. 32. 2. whether will not the pride of blind Men carry them? this is impudence indeed: I suppose it is because of that passage in *vers. 2.* *in whose Spirit there is no guile:* which is only to be understood of Sincerity, as if there was a contrariety betwixt sincere works in our Lives from a sincere principle in the Heart, whereby we approve our selves before Men, and Justification in God's sight without works: One is only the Fruit of the other, there can be no good Fruit but first the Tree must be good.

Doct. 12. *That I say* *Isaiah calls his observing Moses's Law in the Spirit, filthy rags,* *Isa. 64. 3.*

Reply. Not one word of answer to this. As to the 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. with what is spoken there by them in a cavilling way against imputed Righteousness, is all answered in my Book against *Crook and Baily*, most of the Book being taken up about this matter. These Men have a design to weary us in writing the same Answers so many times over to them. Let any of them dare to say plainly that we are justified in God's sight by works done in our own Persons any manner of way.

In the *nineteenth*, there is this, That I explain Imputation, and say, *that it is only by the Blood shedding of Jesus Christ,* and they quote *Animadvers. Pag. 27.*

Reply. I have viewed that whole Page, and there is no such thing there, neither do I at any time place our Justification upon the Blood shedding of Jesus Christ only, but likewise upon Gods Imputation of his active Obedience; but withal, I do prefer (as here they say) the Blood shedding of Jesus Christ above any work done in the Spirit by any of the Sons of Men, in that one was perfect and compleat, the other incompleat as to degree; the one appointed by the Father for this end that it should justify us, the other never appointed for this end. But behold, what a wretched prophane, scurrilous, Atheistical passage, favouring rank of Socinianism, *Pag. 9.* within five lines of the bottom, *And whose act was the shedding of his Blood? was it not his Persecutors?* as if we did look at the second cause, not at the first; as if we should be thankful to Pilate, to Judas, or to the Souldiers for the Sacrifice of Christ. This is spoke in a high scorn to the death of Christ, while they pretend other things, as if the offering up of himself, and the sufferings of the Manhood were no more than the blood of a Thief: We know and believe what the Scripture saith, *That he was deli-* Acts 2. 23.
vered by the determined counsel of God, *that it pleased the Father to*
C
bruise

Isa. 53. 10.
Rom. 8. 32.

bruise him : that the Father spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. See the Spirit of these Men, it will be manifest at length.

The 20th with the Note upon it, is fully spoke to in my Book against Crook and Baily, Pag. 94, 95, 96, 97. That blasphemy of Mr. Powels (as they call it) is taken from Luther upon the *Galatians*, and is spoken of Christ in reference to the imputation of Sin to him, which the *Quakers* deny, and are downright *Soci-nians* in this, and *Hereticks*. There is more said in 1 Cor. 5. ult. *For he hath made him to be Sin for us.* In the close of that Note there is a base reflexion upon the *Independant* Party, as if they did take their ease in their sins, and with vain-hope look to be saved by Christ.

Mark 16. 16.

Reply. As if there was not as much of true Holiness among them as among the *Quakers*, let others judge of that. I ask what will become of those that are as much at ease in their sins as we, as to outward appearance, and yet have no Faith, neither pretend, to any Faith for Justification in the Blood of Christ? *He that believeth not, shall be damned.*

To William Bates his Retraction.

I Wish that all the *Quakers* in England would, as *Augustine* did, write a plain Retraction of all their Errors, they would fill a large Volum: Yet this Retraction of *Will. Bates* is not sufficient to us, whatever it is to them: for it is in Fraud and Deceit to blind the eyes of the Weak, which will appear by these following things, which I take notice of in it. 1. *In that he saith, he is only sorry for his Weakness and Oversight in giving me any such answer; not sorry that he held any such Opinion: he calls it an oversight and weakness, whereas it was high wickedness to assert any such thing: His friends at Hartford say, he spoke unadvisedly, it is too little, they should have said (if hearty in their confession to the same Manhood of Christ) that he spoke blasphemously and madly.* 2. *He saith, his answer proceeded from his ignorance of that Phrase, viz. Humane Nature: which is notoriously false, by his own words before, acknowledging that I explained it by*

by asking him whether the same Flesh, Blood and Bones which were taken of the Virgin had now a Being. 3. He saith, he did not hear or learn it among the Quakers, but tells us not where he learned it, not from the Scriptures; not among any sort of People surely in England: for what sort of People in England holds such a grand Error? then most likely it was the teaching of that Light he follows, which they say every Man hath; which will never discover the true Christ of God, for that knowledg is given by divine Revelation in the Scriptures. 4. He saith, that when he perceived that I took advantage, then he confessed to the same Jesus Christ as now in Being.

Reply. Yet observe, Didst not thou recant or unsay those words, or acknowledg at that time, that what was taken of the Virgin had a Being, but in other words which might better admit of an equivocation? Now, who could believe the same Man at the same time, confessing and denying one and the self same thing? What consistency is there in these Men? who can reconcile sentences diametrically contradictory? how can you make these two speeches agree together, viz. *That which Christ took of the Virgin hath now no Being, and I confess the same Jesus Christ to be now in Being?* out of the same mouth proceeds blessing and cursing. This is like the Quakers writing in this and the other Book, that they give Testimony unto the same Man Christ to be in Heaven, a Place as well as State, and yet in the same Books say, his Body is changed as to Substance, and his Soul is in every Saint. Thus they witness to the Man Christ, that hath neither a Humane Body nor Soul. I earnestly desire once more, that when the Quakers write next they would plainly say, that what the Eternal Word took of the Substance of the Virgin Mary, Joseph's espoused Wife, hath now a Being: we hear them not yet say thus, nor is it written by them. They do sharply inveigh against me in their Paraphrase upon it, Pag. 12. and that for two things.

1. For accusing the Quakers of this Error, when as I told him his Brethren would call him to an account for it.

Reply. I spake that, not as believing they were not all of the same mind, but that they would call him to an account for bewraying his and their opinion in this matter to us sooner than was meet, and in so blunt a phrase as would no way admit of an equivocation: the Quakers are wont to speak more like the Oracles.

2. *In that I would publish this in print.*

Reply. I looked upon it as my duty to print his words, to make manifest your folly, in that I believe the *Quakers* do hold the same gross Error.

Now to the main vindication of their Testimony, Pag. 13.

To my Accusation (as they call it) in my Title Page, saying, that I have demonstrated that it is not the same true and real Man Christ Jesus that they give Testimony unto, but another false and feigned Jesus. They answer by a repetition of the same Testimony used in their former Book, *saying withall, that if I will not believe them, they may not swear to it, nor need any asseveration to clear them, but leave me to God to be dealt withal for my abuse.*

Reply. I dare appeal to the Lord I have not abused them; and I appeal to any impartial Reader, whether I have not proved their Testimony to be fallacious in my *Animadversions*; and all they have now said in their Vindication hath not taken off my Arguments, but made their matter worse. I would fain be satisfied that they are real when they say the same Jesus: but how can I, when they unsay it again, both in their first and second Book? as you shall hear anon. Their Trumpet gives an uncertain sound. If a Witness upon his lawful oath agrees not with himself, none can credit him: you may thank your selves for your equivocating and inconsistent way of writing, that hath made us so hard of belief: whether it is your ignorance in Divinity, or your cunning craftiness and sleight, let others judge.

The second thing to make good their confession to the true Manhood of Christ, is, *Will. Pen's confession at the Barbican Meeting.* They say I have not made good my Charge, *viz.* That the *Quakers* did there deny the Manhood of Christ.

Reply. We had this before in their Introduction, now to fill up we have it again. There you may see, they say I put it off by a Certificate of *W. B.* his denial of Christ. Here they tell you I wave my proof another way, *viz.* By putting a sinister meaning upon *Will. Pens* words, I do no way wave it; but it is to no purpose for me to write what I heard in that Meeting from the *Quakers* own Mouths, I shall not be credited by them, I therefore refer the Reader to those two Books printed as accounts of that Dispute, that which the *Quakers* themselves put forth, and that which the *Baptists* published.

But

But as to my seeking for a *meaning*, well I may, when as it is well known, the *Quakers* frequently say one thing and mean another. Now, how should we know their meaning but by their grand *Rabby's* Exposition? therefore I produced *G. Fox's* own words: now pray take special cognizance of this, the *principal words in that sentence* are quite omitted by the *Quakers*, viz. *The Man may speak*, then it follows, *Christ in the Male and in the Female*: either they are ashamed of these words, or else they pass them as beyond their skill to vindicate them; they might do well to make *G. Fox* retract them. Moreover, my citation out of *Smith's* Primmer they wholly omit, which was full to the purpose. Thus are we answered, as *Canis ad Nilum*, the Dog lapt at the River *Nilus*, a lap here and there as they please, but no steady handling of any Argument. Again, observe *G. Fox's* words, so many of them as they retain, are not rightly cited by them as they are in his Book, and written by me in my last Book; so nothing but deceit in these Men to put a gloss upon their absurd Writings, and to blind and cozen the People. *G. Fox's* words are these, *G. Myst.* Pag. 71. *Christ's Nature is not Humane which is earthly, for that is the first Adams.* To this I say in my *Animadversion*, that according to *G. Fox* Christ is such a Man as hath no Humane Nature, such a Man as never had a nature that was of an earthly substance, such a Man as never came of *Adam's* Race and Line; and *Will. Pen's* Man Christ Jesus that he in the *Barbican* Meeting confessed to, and *G. Fox's* must needs be one and the same: How do the *Quakers* take this off? why they say that this proves no more that they deny the Man Christ to ascend into Heaven, than it proves the Apostles deny it, when they confess that Jesus Christ was in them, quoting *Gal. 4. 6.* *He hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts.* Now let the Reader judge if this be any thing at all to their purpose, except they will say that the Apostle understands by the Spirit of the Son, the Humane Soul or Body of Jesus Christ, that either of these or both were sent into the hearts of the Saints; cannot the Spirit of the Son be sent into the hearts of the Saints, and yet the Man Christ that ascended remain in Heaven as Man? and not as *G. Fox*, be in the Female Preacher, and speak in her.

The second Scripture in this Paragraph, *Pag. 14.* in *1 Cor. 15. 45, 47.* which they bring in with sound of Trumpet, flourishing Colours, Bullet in Mouth, much boasting repetition to prove

Prove this, or else nothing, That Christs Nature as *G. Fox* saith, is not Humane Earthly, nor of the first *Adam*, (*i. e.*) Christ hath now no Humane Nature, that is of an Earthly Substance. Mark diligently and *they* are their own words, speaking of me, *if he still believes Christs Nature to be of an Earthly Substance*, (*i. e.*) *as that of the first Adam's*, yet remember they plead for the same Man Jesus to have ascended, and to be in Heaven a place, the same, and yet with a Substance of another Nature. Good Philosophers! the same, and not the same, but another: As if one should say, it is the same Angel that came to *Manoah's* Wife, and then to *Manoah* himself, only the Substance and Nature of the Angel was changed into the Substance and Nature of a Man. Well, but go to, this Scripture will carry all before it, *vers. 45. The first man Adam was made a living Soul, the last Adam a quickening Spirit.* There was one *Apolinaris* long since that held this Opinion from this Scripture, *viz.* That Jesus Christ had not a living Soul to inform his Humane Body, but the Holy Ghost instead of the Soul; and, as the *Quakers* bring it, one would think they were of the same Mind, and till they clear themselves, I believe they are, which is a mad wicked Error: for then Jesus Christ was never truly a Man when here on Earth. Now, this Scripture was true of him when on Earth as well as now in Heaven; take special notice of this, that according to the *Quakers*, till they farther explain themselves, Jesus Christ neither is now, nor ever was a true real Man, in that he never had a living Soul as the first *Adam* had: for the first *Adam* is brought in opposition to the second. *Vers. 47. The first man is of the Earth, Earthly: the second man is the Lord from Heaven:* The *Manichees* concluded from hence, that Christ had not a Body of an Earthly Nature taken of the Substance of the Virgin, but that he brought a Body from Heaven, and passed with it thorow the Womb of the Virgin. Now have we any cause but to think the *Quakers* of this mind, till they write next, and write plainly: For this *Lord from Heaven* in the Text is opposed to the *first Man*, that is *of the Earth, earthly*, and it was true of him when here on Earth: then Jesus Christ never had an earthly Body. Thus now both Soul and Body is gone, he neither hath them now, nor never had them. See a Man the *Quakers* have confessed to; a Man that never had, nor hath a living Soul, nor an Earthly Body as the first *Adam* had. Now, we believe the Man Jesus Christ had a living Soul as the first *Adam* had, and that now he hath that same living Soul, and that he had a Body that

that was of the Earth, Earthly, as the first *Adam* had ; and that he hath the same Body for Substance now he is in Heaven, otherwise he never was, neither is now a real Man. But over and above this living Soul, he had the Holy Ghost without measure, and as the Son of God brought it from Heaven with him, when he took hold of the Seed of *Abraham* and *David* in the Womb of the Virgin : And thus he transcended the first *Adam*, and was a quickening Spirit, the cause of all Spiritual and Eternal Life to the Church. We believe that the Humane Body of Christ, which both for Substance and Qualities when here on Earth, was like to *Adam's* and other Mens, Sin excepted, is now changed only as to Qualities. *Pag. 15.* Those two Scriptures, *Col. 1. 15. Heb. 1. 3.* are wont to be brought against the *Arrians*, but to what purpose against us we see not, who heartily own the Eternal most Supreme Deity of the Son of God. We understand these two Scriptures speaking of the Person of Christ as Mediator, in which there were and are two Natures, Divine and Humane, and in his Person he was and is the Image of the Invisible God (as that in the *Colossians* speaks) both as having the same Essence, and shewing forth in his Person when on Earth the Divine Perfections, and *we beheld his glory (the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth, Joh. 1. 14.* But to say that the Man Christ was the Image of the Invisible God, and the brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person as Man, except you speak figuratively, by the communication of Ideum's, we cannot allow it ; and to speak here as you do of the first Man, to be made after the Image of God, and then presently say, the second Man is the Image of the Invisible, as if there was a Visible and an Invisible God, and then to talk of two Manhoods that Christ had, one the Image of the Substance of God, (i. e.) as *ALL* interpret it, the Essence it self ; one Manhood then, that is and was the Godhead ; the other which was allotted for him, and proper for his condition, not telling whether he hath now any such Manhood of such an inferiour Nature, is wild mad Divinity.

In *Pag. 15.* They complain that I pervert their words, when I draw up the sum of one part of *Will. Pen's* Confession, his believing the Man Christ to be glorified in Heaven ; that it is no more than this, *viz. That the Light within being hearkened to and obeyed, is lifted up, and exalted, and glorified in the hearts of Men ; that nothing is more obvious in our discourses with them than that Heaven is within them, so that when they say the same Man ascended to Heaven, they mean the Globe which we call the Earth.*

Reply.

Reply. Take notice that here is not a word against that meaning that I ascribed to the *Quakers* words. They deny not but that they do mean this of the Light within; and again, when I say that I have heard them commonly assert that Heaven is within them; to that not a word, silence is consent. What then, that thus I should pervert their words, that when they confess Christ to ascend to Heaven, they mean nothing but that Globe which we call the Earth. Now let the Reader judge if I have wronged them, it was upon that, their affirming that Christ's exaltation was not that he might remain in a place remote, and the reason was, that Head and Members must not be asunder. Now go to, we are reasoning about the real Manhood, and it argues that they speak of this in that they use the word *Exaltation*. Christ as to his Divine Nature was never properly exalted, besides they speak of a *place remote*; now the Deity of the Son cannot be supposed by any to be in a place, a place is only for a Body: this implies that this Manhood is in a place, but not a remote place, because it must be where the Body is. Now it's evident the Mystical Body, part of it at least, is on Earth; and Heaven is granted by all, that believes there is any such place, to be remote. It's called the *third Heaven, the supream, far above the other Heavens*. Now if not in this Heaven, but in some nigh place, yea so nigh as not to be asunder from the Mystical Body, the Saints; where can that be but this Globe the Earth, the Saints being here. Let them speak what it is more that they mean than what I have imputed to them, *viz.* The Light within is the Man Christ; Heaven is within; when he then ascended into this Heaven, was exalted; was it any more than the Light being lifted up, and exalted in the hearts of Men? But lastly, I would query what it was that did ascend? is not this word used in deceit? There can be no Exaltation at all, according to the *Quakers* Principles: for as to the Soul of Christ that is one and the same with the Holy Ghost in all the Saints, that cannot be said to ascend. 2. The Humane Body was changed upon the Resurrection as to the Substance of it, this they plead for, when they bring Scripture to prove his appearing in another form, in *Pag. 29.* of this their Vindication, towards the latter end of the Page, they make Substance and Fashion, or Form, all one: see their own words.

Now tell us what ascended, if neither Soul nor Body? They tell us before, they conclude this in *Pag. 16.* that the Mystery of Christ in Spirit doth no way oppose the History of Christ in the Flesh.

Reply.

Reply. Yes, your Mystery of Christ in Spirit doth diametrically oppose it; for if the Soul of Christ's Manhood be the Holy Ghost, then he never was nor is a true Man, and then the History of him in the Flesh is false.

Pag. 16. They complain of me for writing that *the Quakers have lost their Credit with many, in that we have caught them juggling, &c.*

Reply. I might retract my words here, and say, I was out in saying so, in that they never had any Credit among the Godly of the Nation.

In the same Paragraph, *It is not saying and unsaying to speak of Christs Exaltation, and yet assert that he must not be separate from his Body, because it is (say they) his Spiritual presence that they speak of.*

Reply. It comes all to one, while by the Spirit they mean the Soul of the Manhood, for then the Man Christ never ascended; that is not a Man that hath not a true real Humane Soul.

Next Paragraph, *Pag. ibid.* *They say that Change that they believe Christ to have had, which as a Son he had with the Father before the World was, doth not deny Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah: so quotes John 17. 15.*

Reply. O what Serpentine craft is in every line! *To have had,* implying the Man Christ hath it not now, it is a thing past, *which as a Son,* as the Son of God he had, a glory from Eternity, which *Joh. 17. 5.* speaks of, but as the Son of God, did he undergo a change from Mortality to Immortality as the Manhood did? Why do you affect to wrap your selves in Clouds, to darken Knowledge by words? why do you speak thus with a double tongue? Did not Christ speak that, *Glorify thou me,* in reference to his Manhood? Will you still cog? Is not that attributed to the whole Person that in propriety and strictness of Speech is only due to one Nature? This Falacy runs throughout their Book. This change that you say Christ Jesus had upon his Ascension, is an utter denial of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah: for if his Body be changed as to Substance, and his Soul be the Holy Ghost, let the *Quakers* tell us what of Jesus of Nazareth remains now that was not 3000 Years since? yea, why *Enoch* and *Eliab* that were translated, are not the Messiah as well as Jesus of Nazareth, when as the same real Manhood that was taken of the Virgin is no more proper and peculiar to Jesus than *Eliab*? nay, that same numerical Flesh and Blood is

not at all according to them; and as to the Soul, it is the Holy Ghost, and so not only in Jesus of Nazareth but in *Elijah* and in *Enoch*, and in all the Saints. Let them plainly tell us what peculiar thing it is in Being that constitutes Jesus of Nazareth, and not *Elijah* and *Enoch* to be the Messiah.

Pag. 17. They say I charge them falsely in saying, that they suppose the Manhood (as I call it) that was taken of the Virgin is turned into an immense infinite Being, a Deity; it was never our supposition that the meer Flesh and Blood that the Son took of the Virgin, which was of the same which the Children had, became a Deity.

Reply. By what hath been now said by the Quakers, 1. They suppose that either it was not a Manhood that was taken of the Virgin, nor ought it to be called so: for mark, they add this, *as thou calls it*. What! not suffer me to call that which was taken of the Virgin, a Manhood? Or they suppose at least another Manhood beside this that was taken of the Virgin, *the meer Flesh and Blood which was part of the same the Children had*, (will not say, it is part of the same now;) they never supposed that this meer Flesh and Blood was turned into a Deity. But was there any other sort of Flesh and Blood that was not taken of the Virgin that was not the same with the Childrens that became a Deity, the which it was not before? or do you mean it was the Soul that was turned, not the *meer Flesh and Blood*? would you once leave these Legerdemain tricks. As to the *meer Flesh and Blood*, I will acquit them; they never did say this was turn'd into a Deity, for according to them, this is annihilated, is not now at all, the Body is changed as to Substance: and take the Qualities and Substance of a Body away and what remains? How then can it be true that I charge them withall? why thus, the Soul is an essential part of the Man Christ. Now this they say is in every Saint: Then the Manhood, and all the Manhood that they will grant is in Being, is turn'd into a Deity; for what is immense is God, and to be in Millions of Saints at once argues immensity. If they say, this was not taken of the Virgin: I reply, that the whole Man is said to be born of the Woman, though his Soul is created; *Man that is born of a Woman*. This phrase you have often in the Book of Job. I do no where as I remember, charge them to say that the meer Flesh and Blood is changed into a Deity, this I could not do, in that I apprehend they nullify both: however, you know that by Flesh in Scripture sometimes is understood the whole Man, *All flesh hath corrupted its way*, Gen. 6.

Pag. 17. Parag. 2. *They are angry that I tell them of their arguing from the power of Christ to his Will, comparing them herein to the Papists in the matter of Transubstantiation.*

Reply. Let the impartial Reader judge if you do not argue from the power of Christ to his Will, let him see if this be not the plain import of your reasoning, *Christ had all power, therefore he might descend at his pleasure.* His Power is made the ground of his Will to descend, he could descend from Heaven since his Ascension, for all power is given to him, therefore he hath: this is the same with what the Papists say, he can turn the Bread into his Body, therefore it is turned: But the *Quakers* say, his Will is expressed as well as Power, *Lo I am with you to the end of the World*; so say the Papists from that Scripture, *This is my Body*: that at the first view looks as much for them as the other for the *Quakers*. In this matter now the great contest is about the right understanding of Christ's being with his Disciples to the end; you should have said and proved that it is his Will to be present with his Disciples in his Manhood and Humane Nature, otherwise you say nothing: contrary to these Scriptures, *The Poor ye have always with you, me ye have not always. Now I am no more in the World,* Joh. 17. 11. *I leave the World and go to the Father*: something then is absent from the Earth, if neither Godhead nor Manhood, what is, let the *Quakers* tell us?

Pag. *ibid.* Towards the end, they tell you, *that I deny Jesus Christ to be on Earth as he is Man, either to his Body or Spirit.*

Reply. Yea I do, if you will but give me leave to explain myself, That by Spirit I understand the Soul, the Essential part of the Manhood, a finite Creature, yet can say the Son was and is still present with his Saints on Earth, and the whole Son of God, but not the whole and all of the Son of God.

Pag. *ibid.* Pag. 18. *It is not a corporal or carnal union between Christ and his Members that we plead for, that is not the controversy, nor do we speak of the Manhood being Locally or Personally present with or in the Saints, as he would insinuate.*

Reply. Sometimes they will, sometimes they will not, sometimes they neither will nor will not: It must be the carnal corporal union that they plead for, if any part of the Manhood be present with or in the Saints; and if either Soul or Body be present, it is a carnal presence of the Manhood. Thus we argue, and fasten this upon you according to the true sense we have of the Manhood; but

indeed according to that sense that they have of the Manhood, we can freely grant they plead for no such thing as the Manhood to be Locally and Personally present with or in the Saints, when-as there is neither Person nor Manhood according to them. Christ is only a quality or power within them; but if the Man Christ be neither Personally nor Locally present on Earth, we would know in what sense; if they say only virtually, we grant it; (*i. e.*) the Son of God as he is an infinite Spirit in relation and reference to the Manhood; let them but say this and there is an end, still saving the Essential Properties of the Manhood.

Pag. *ibid.* and 19. they quote my Argument *Animad.* Pag. 10. against Christ's Soul being present in and with the Saints on Earth, I say *it must either be with, or without the Body, or extended from Heaven to Earth; and if extended, this would make it immense, and so God.*

They do not fully recite my Argument: but what say they to it as they have recited it? only opposes to it what I have said of the Humane Nature, *that it ought to be worshipped, and that it giveth life to our Souls*: There is no contradiction in all this, do but view the distinctions in my *Antidote*, how the Humane Nature is to be worshipped, and how the Flesh giveth life to the World.

But the *Quakers*, Pag. 19. Lin. 2. do imply that the Humane Nature must be extended to us on Earth, either Soul or Body, or both; hear their own words, *can it do so? (i. e.) give life, (speaking of the Humane Nature) and yet his Spirit not so much as extend to us, though immensely impowred by the Deity.*

Reply. They are shy of the word Soul, but still call it Spirit, that if need be they may have something to plead from the Word if driven to a strait: but observe here, they distinguish it from the Deity, for they say *it is immensely impowred with the Deity.* I am glad of this distinction; now I leave the Reader to judge, whether the Spirit of the Man Christ his Humane Soul can be said to be *immensely impowred with the Deity*? I mean, whether the immensity of God, which is Infiniteness and Omnipresency, can be communicated to a Creature? whether God can make a Creature immense? whether God can make a Creature God? This is a contradiction, and would argue weakness in God to effect it, and there must then be a new God in time. Withal consider, it would follow then that the Spirit and Body of Jesus Christ were both of them immense upon Earth when in the state of Humiliation, for he was then
impowred

impowred with the Deity, to use their Phrase, as much as now ; he had then the Spirit upon him without measure, and the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily in him then, yet his Manhood was not immense, nor could be in two places at once.

John 3.
Col. 2.

Pag. 19. We are at length come to five Questions which they state to determine the Business, to which I will with all readiness and plainness answer ; but withal, desire them to tell me their results about them, if yet determined in their Minds, if yet time-a-day to let the People know their Divinity.

Quest. 1. If the Soul and Spirit of Christ be not one and the same ?

Ans. Yea, the Soul of Christ and the Spirit of the Manhood are one and the same ; he had a real Humane Soul, otherwise he never was a compleat Man, and this is the same with the Spirit of the Manhood.

Quest. 2. If he was the Son of God before the World was, what then was his Soul, and in what time created ?

Ans. He was the Son of God from Eternity : and it is not proper to ask what his Soul was then, in that by Soul we understand a Creature which could not be from Eternity : there is, we can say, the Spirit of the Godhead, that is the Essence, and this Christ as the Son of God had from Eternity and his Personality. We can say the Soul of the Son of God's Manhood is a Creature, and we can say, if you ask when this was created, upon the first conception of the Body in the Womb of the Virgin : by this question may we not think that the Quakers suppose that Christ Jesus had no Soul that was or is a Creature.

Quest. 3. If the Spirit of Christ and the Holy Ghost be separated and divided ?

*Ans. The Spirit of his Manhood and the Holy Ghost are to be separated in our consideration, they have two distinct natures and essences, and have distinct essential properties : It's said in Scripture, *My soul is sorrowful unto death ; and he gave his soul an Offering for Sin ; and thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell.* Luk. 23. *Father into thy hands I commend my Spirit ; and having said thus, he gave up the Ghost.* None of these things can be said of the Deity, or the Holy Ghost.*

Quest. 4. If Jesus Christ in all the parts essential and proper to him be so circumscribed and limited in Heaven, as in no sense and degree to be present with and in his Saints on Earth, then how is that promise made good, Lo I am with you alway to the end of the World ?

Ans.

Answ. Here is the Fallacy of *plurium interrogationum*, of more questions than should be, of divers natures jumbled together, *Jesus Christ in all the parts essential to him as Man, Body, Soul and Spirit*, and Spirit of the Manhood should be added, *in no sense or degree as to this Manhoods Local Personal presence on Earth*, then it would answer it self; we can say the Man Christ is present with his Saints on Earth, and speak in a figure, (*i. e.*) as he is the Son of God, attributing that to the Person denominated by one name, which is only true of the other; this is only true of him as he is the Son of God, so he is immense and infinite and omnipresent; the Spirit of the Godhead is present in the Saints acting in relation to the Manhood, and that promise, *viz. Lo I am with you*, ought thus to be understood: I ask the *Quakers* how this can be true that he said, *I leave the World and will see you no more*, if Christ be present with his Saints locally in any part of his Manhood?

Quest. 5. Doth not God send the Spirit of his Son into Believers hearts, that thereby they might partake of his holy and heavenly nature, and humanity, of the same meekness? &c.

Reply. The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son, it proceeds not only from the Father but also the Son, *Joh. 16. I will send the Comforter*, and in that it takes of Christ's things and declares them to us, and acts still in reference to the Mediator. This Spirit makes us Partakers of the Heavenly Divine Nature, (*i. e.*) working Gifts in us, that makes us like to the Son of God, not that we partake of the divine Essence. I fear that monstrous Opinion of the *Ranters* is among the *Quakers*, of being Deified, Godheaded with God, and Christheaded with Christ, let them speak for themselves. That Phrase, *of being Partakers of his Humanity by the Spirit of the Son in our hearts*, is unscriptural and unsound, for then we must have part of his Humane Soul and Body, which cannot be; he would not then be an entire Man, preserve still the essential properties of the Manhood. That meekness, gentleness which (as they say) the Spirit works in us, are the same for kind, but not for number with those that the Man Christ had and hath in him, *And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace*: Take heed and beware of strange Doctrines.

John. 1.

Pag. 20. Parag. 1. It's very tedious following these Men, that like Squirrels leap from one thing to another; if they had answered in that Method that was laid down in my *Animadversions*, it had been more easie for me to trace them, but I have undertaken the task.

task. *They ask whether I worship Christ as a finite Creature? I have often asked the Quakers whether they worship Christ within them or without them? and can have no answer. The Light within was worshipped in Naylor: but they have an answer ready from my own Writings to this Question, they resolve it no, but in union with the Deity; then they make this conclusion, they hope that in that union he hath power to minister of his own life and vertue to all that believe.*

Reply. He hath so, He is a Person in this union, and acts as a Person, but his natures are not to be confounded, mixed, changed one with and into one another; and still remember this phrase of *his own life*, is not the Essence of the Deity, that cannot be communicated: I doubt the Quakers are of the same mind with Servetus.

They say here, that I grant that as God, Christ is in all the Saints, then add shew us the Father and it sufficeth: he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father: therefore the true knowledg of Christ is through the Son.

Reply. At that very time when Christ said so, *He that hath seen, &c.* He had a Body that was seen with the carnal bodily eye, therefore it is spoken by a figure, as I am constrained often to repeat by the frequent recurring of the same things in their Books: what is proper to one nature is attributed to the whole, that Son through whom is now the sight of God, is God and Man in one Person.

Pag. 20. Parag. 2. They tell you my Opinion concerning the presence of Christ with his Saints, viz. *That the immense, infinite God is in them, but is nothing essential to the heavenly Man Christ Jesus (the Son of God) as such extended to them.*

I have answered this before. They censure me for imposing senses upon their words; but here let the Reader judge, whether I am not imposed upon, my sense is, that the Spirit of God dwells and works in the Saints, in relation to Christ as Mediator, which he is in both Natures, Divine and Humane, and this is more then to dwell in them as an immense God: What they mean by *something essential to the heavenly Man to be extended*, I know not; I dare not say that any thing of the essence of the Son of God is communicated, only, *of his fulness we receive.*

There is a fallacy here, *Heavenly Man Christ Jesus the Son of God?*

Reply. He was called Christ before he was Jesus, he was the Son of God before he was a heavenly Man.

Answ. Here is the Fallacy of *plurium interrogationum*, of more questions than should be, of divers natures jumbled together, *Jesus Christ in all the parts essential to him as Man, Body, Soul and Spirit*, and Spirit of the Manhood should be added, *in no sense or degree as to this Manhoods Local Personal presence on Earth*, then it would answer it self; we can say the Man Christ is present with his Saints on Earth, and speak in a figure, (*i. e.*) as he is the Son of God, attributing that to the Person denominated by one name, which is only true of the other; this is only true of him as he is the Son of God, so he is immense and infinite and omnipresent; the Spirit of the Godhead is present in the Saints acting in relation to the Manhood, and that promise, *viz. Lo I am with you*, ought thus to be understood: I ask the *Quakers* how this can be true that he said, *I leave the World and will see you no more*, if Christ be present with his Saints locally in any part of his Manhood?

Quest. 5. Doth not God send the Spirit of his Son into Believers hearts, that thereby they might partake of his holy and heavenly nature, and humanity, of the same meekness? &c.

Reply. The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son, it proceeds not only from the Father but also the Son, *Joh. 16. I will send the Comforter*, and in that it takes of Christ's things and declares them to us, and acts still in reference to the Mediator. This Spirit makes us Partakers of the Heavenly Divine Nature, (*i. e.*) working Gifts in us, that makes us like to the Son of God, not that we partake of the divine Essence. I fear that monstrous Opinion of the *Ranters* is among the *Quakers*, of being Deified, Godheaded with God, and Christheaded with Christ, let them speak for themselves. That Phrase, *of being Partakers of his Humanity by the Spirit of the Son in our hearts*, is unscriptural and unsound, for then we must have part of his Humane Soul and Body, which cannot be; he would not then be an entire Man, preserve still the essential properties of the Manhood. That meekness, gentleness which (as they say) the Spirit works in us, are the same for kind, but not for number with those that the Man Christ had and hath in him, *And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace*: Take heed and beware of strange Doctrines.

John. 1.

Pag. 20. Parag. 1. It's very tedious following these Men, that like Squirrils leap from one thing to another; if they had answered in that Method that was laid down in my *Animadversions*, it had been more easie for me to trace them, but I have undertaken the task.

task: *They ask whether I worship Christ as a finite Creature? I have often asked the Quakers whether they worship Christ within them or without them? and can have no answer. The Light within was worshipped in Naylor: but they have an answer ready from my own Writings to this Question, they resolve it no, but in union with the Deity; then they make this conclusion, they hope that in that union he hath power to minister of his own life and vertue to all that believe.*

Reply. He hath so, He is a Person in this union, and acts as a Person, but his natures are not to be confounded, mixed, changed one with and into one another; and still remember this phrase of *his own life*, is not the Essence of the Deity, that cannot be communicated: I doubt the *Quakers* are of the same mind with *Servetus*.

They say here, that I grant that as God, Christ is in all the Saints, then add shew us the Father and it sufficeth: he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father: therefore the true knowledg of Christ is through the Son.

Reply. At that very time when Christ said so, *He that hath seen, &c.* He had a Body that was seen with the carnal bodily eye, therefore it is spoken by a figure, as I am constrained often to repeat by the frequent recurring of the same things in their Books: what is proper to one nature is attributed to the whole, that Son through whom is now the sight of God, is God and Man in one Person.

Pag. 20. Parag. 2. They tell you my Opinion concerning the presence of Christ with his Saints, viz. *That the immense, infinite God is in them, but is nothing essential to the heavenly Man Christ Jesus (the Son of God) as such extended to them.*

I have answered this before. They censure me for imposing senses upon their words; but here let the Reader judge, whether I am not imposed upon, my sense is, that the Spirit of God dwells and works in the Saints, in relation to Christ as Mediator, which he is in both Natures, Divine and Humane, and this is more then to dwell in them as an immense God: What they mean by *something essential to the heavenly Man to be extended*, I know not; I dare not say that any thing of the essence of the Son of God is communicated, only, *of his fulness we receive.*

There is a fallacy here, *Heavenly Man Christ Jesus the Son of God?*

Reply. He was called Christ before he was Jesus, he was the Son of God before he was a heavenly Man.

Pag. 20. and 21. They have again that Scripture, *All power in Heaven and Earth is given me, Lo I am with you, &c.* They ask, *is this only as an infinite God?*

Reply. No, but as the Spirit of the Son which works in a different way and mode in the Saints, than in any part of the Creation besides.

They ask, *Who gave him this power?*

Reply. The Father gave him this power as he is Mediator, so Christ is inferiour; and this power let the *Quakers* take notice is not to be understood of Omnipotency, that he had as the Son of God from Eternity, that could not be given in time, as this power was, but it was a right to govern the Church as Mediator, this was given in time. I cannot forget a strange passage out of *Smith's* Primmer, which I leave to the Reader to judge what the *Quakers* thoughts are; He speaks this of the Light that every Man hath, *All power in Heaven and Earth is in it.*

Pag. *ibid.* Lin. 5. *And if as a Son he be wholly separated?*

Reply. He is present as a Son with his Saints in his Deity, and by the Holy Ghost, and acts in all things as a blessed Mediator towards them, still preserving the essentials of the Manhood intire.

They ask, *Is there nothing of the heavenly and holy Manhood in this Spirit of the Son but the meer infinite Deity?*

Reply. That is an odd Phrase not to be admitted, *The Manhood in the Spirit of the Son*: is not this to make a composition of the natures one into another, which must not be? the Spirit of the Son hath a personality besides the essence of the Deity, and acts in this his proper relation still in reference to the Mediator.

They ask again, *Doth it intercede to it self without respect to the Mediator as Mediator?* &c.

Reply. None is able to transcribe all their confused words. The Spirit helps us to pray to the Father in the name of the Son, *Eph. 2. 18.*

They had the Gospel in the Name of the Father, Son and Spirit, who are inseparable, and not divided in Heaven and Earth.

Reply. They are to be divided, (*i. e.*) distinguished in their Personalities, not in their Essence; the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, nor the Spirit, Father or Son; the Son is begotten, the Spirit proceeds, the Father neither is begotten nor proceeds: O that they were found in this great point of the Trinity, and the mediation of the Son! It's well you would once stick to found

good old wholesome Doctrine of the Church of Christ ; you confound the natures of Christ, and understand all this you have written here, and whenever you write or speak of the Light that every Man hath, not of the Person of Christ God-Man, so that your Gospel you have received is but another Gospel.

Pag. 22. Parag. 1. *They say, I give another instance to prove the Man Christ in or with his Members, as to his Spirit or spiritual Presence, not to be now on Earth.*

Reply. To insert this last Phrase is downright Knavery, when as frequently they tell you in this Book, that I have confessed to the spiritual Presence of Christ in his Saints, the instance is from *Acts 3. 21. Whom the Heaven must contain until the times of restitution of all things* : I say, this Scripture attended to, would put an end to all their cavils, and do urge them to say, whether these times are already come.

To which they here answer, *That they are already begun, that this restitution was the gathering of the Church of Jews and Gentiles into the fellowship of the Son.*

Reply. How strong, how noble, how forcible are the right words of the Scripture ! The Apostle saith, *until the restitution of all things.* The *Quakers* say, *the restitution of some things.* The Apostle speaks plainly of the compleating and finishing ; they speak of the beginning : which will you believe ? Besides, they tell you this restitution is a gathering of the Church of Jew and Gentile. Peter that knew best his own words tells you, *2 Pet. 3. of new Heavens and new Earth*, after the burning of the old, for which state of things *Rom. 8.* tells you, *the Creature groans* by an instinct that God hath put into it. Is not this a renovation then of the whole Creation that is here spoke of ? that which the *Quakers* speak of, was begun 1600 Years since, in the time when Peter spake this, yea before. Now, view the Text, doth it speak of a thing past, or present, or of a thing to come ? judg ye. Then again, the *Quakers* say, *how far the Phrase Heavens extend.* The Apostle Peter here saith *Heaven*, not *Heavens*, and the Scripture calls it *God's dwelling place*, the *third Heaven*, the *Heaven of Heavens*, which cannot contain God, but can the Manhood. The *Quakers* would extend this Heaven to the Earth, into Infinity, to be every where, if they would speak out : so that the Heaven containing the Man Christ, is no more than the soul of Christ being in all his Saints ; see what a come-off here is.

Pag. 23, 24. Nothing material, but the same over again, only in the last *Parag.* of Pag. 24. They bring an Argument *ad hominem*, as they call it, the sum of it is this: That I say the Deity is every where, and can in no wise be said that the Heavens receive it, and is in all the Saints; why then, neither can it be said that Christ came again as to his Deity since his ascension, which is all they would make you believe that I affirm when I speak of Christ's coming in the Spirit; why then, this coming must be something else, it must have some respect to his Manhood.

Reply. I willingly grant it. Christ came again in the Spirit of the Son, which always had a relation and respect to the glorified Manhood. It did thus testify of the Son as crucified, risen, interceding, and so comforted their hearts: This is more than to be as to its Immensity every where; this is another way, manner, operation, dispensation; will not this satisfy, except I say, he came in his Manhood, whom the Heaven retain until the renovation of all things?

Pag. 25. There is a mighty thing against me, and mighty insulting over me upon it, That when as I will not admit the Manhood to be out of Heaven, but circumscribed there, yet I say, the Deity perfects all in us; but then the Humanity is in union with it, and acts with it, and that they must not be put asunder. They say two things upon this. 1. That I am for Perfection. 2. In that I say the Deity and Manhood act and work together, I must hold that the Manhood is extended as far as the Deity, that is, into Heaven, Earth, and Hell. Thus they have bound me, and the Philistines are upon me; but do but wait a while, and through the strength of God you will see the Withs and the Cords fly off.

Reply. When I say the Deity perfects all good in us, I mean as to Parts in this World, as to degree in our passage into Heaven, but what as to the other I could bid you look back and see enough said to it before. This we had in the Introduction, and since, indeed we had well nigh the whole in that Introduction, as they call it, all the rest is but the meer Wire-drawing of it to a greater length with words. You must excuse me then if you have the same answer frequent, and now and then a little larger. These Men a little farther have quoted a Doctor in this quarrel, I would take leave to quote another, to us as famous in Divinity as their Doctor, Dr. Ames *Med. Theol.* l. 1. p. 87. c. 18. *De Persona Christi*, He is speaking of the Personal Communication of Properties, which

which is neither a real transfusion, nor a real donation, but *est communio vel concursus ad easdem operationes, ita ut simul presentur ab utraque natura sed secundum suas distinctas proprietates*, (i. e.) There is communion and concurrence to the same actions; so that they are performed together by both natures, but according to their distinct properties. Now I may easily get over this mighty Precipice that they had drowned me in. *The Humanity is in union with the Deity, and acts with it, and they must not be put asunder*, (i. e.) in their actions, to which I was speaking; so (saith Ames) all operations are performed together by both natures, but according to their distinct Properties: Now, I ask if it be a property of the Manhood to be Immense in every place where the Deity is? Why then, they are not asunder as to their actions, but there is an union in all them, yet not as to their locality. The Humanity is not in all places where the Deity is which is infinite, yet the Deity is always where the Manhood is, and acts in and through it as an Organ or Instrument, yet the Humane Nature can be but in one place at a time, and that place is Heaven which contains it; the Soul acts with the Body in all Humane actions, yet the Soul can emit thoughts to the ends of the Earth the Body remaining in its place; the Sun in the Firmament can send forth light and heat throughout the Hemisphere, yet the body of the Sun remains in the Firmament. These similitudes I grant fall short very much. I make use of them only to illustrate, not to prove. Why should it be thought a thing impossible that Christ's Manhood should act at a distance in its way and manner? These Men would have the Manhood in all places where the Spirit of the Son is, or the Holy Ghost, they are evidently ubiquitaries, which the Martyrs were mightily against, in their contentions with the Papists; save the essential Properties of the Manhood, and say what you will of it, turn it not into a Deity, for then Christ is no longer a Mediator as to that nature.

Pag. 26. There is much-a-do to make out this notion still, viz. That it is not only the immense God but Jesus Christ in some sense that comes from Heaven on Earth to the Saints, and works in their hearts, one medium to prove it, is two Scriptures recited, 1 Thess. 1. 9, 10. Tit. 2. 13. where is mention made of the Christian's waiting for his Son from Heaven, and looking for the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour, &c. These two Scriptures are nothing to their purpose, they speak of the local coming of the

Man Christ to Judgment, which is not yet ; the Christians in that day notwithstanding were to wait for it, and be in readiness, not knowing when the time would be. The other Scripture which they produce is for them, *Heb. 13. 20, 21.* and I willingly grant it, that God as he is the *God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd, &c.* so he works in us. I have said it frequently, and say it again, the Spirit works in relation to Christ's Manhood, his Death, his Resurrection as here, and his Intercession.

Pag. ibid. They find fault with my asserting, that all the places where we read of Jesus Christ by name appearing, are not to be understood, as if Christ in Body came down from Heaven ; but either he was seen, the Heavens being opened, or it was in extasy : This last they say, is for a Man not to be in the exercise of his Reason, and add, that I may preach or pray long enough before I be in one ; and ask, if the Christians of old were to wait for Christ till they were in extasies, then they were not to see him while in their wits.

Reply. Is not here a brisk frolick. Were both *Peter* and *Paul* out of their wits when both were in Trances and Extasies ? As for me, I hope indeed (as they say) I shall never have such Extasies or Trances as they speak of in Praying or Preaching : I thank them for that, such they mean surely as the *Quakers* in the North at *Kendal* and other places had at their first rise ; and one would think these Extasies had not yet quite left them, whoever is but well acquainted with their Praying, Preaching, Writing : As for the primitive Christians, take no thought, Christ will take care to find them in their right wits when he in his second coming appears unto them ; they are now in Extasies, and Raptures, and Visions of Glory with Christ, yet in their right Reason and Understanding, and will be then : But after this frolick they are grown sober again, and are almost revived out of the Extasy they were in to their right wits, and acknowledg

Pag. 27. Peter and Paul had these Extasies, and yet kept their wits, that was much ; but this hinders not their spiritual sight of Christ in their daily enjoyment of God.

Reply. No, they had both ; but this is that we say stil, Christ as to his Manhood since his Ascension did not appear locally to *Peter* and *Paul*, they might have saved, you see, abundance of labour in this Book, both here and elsewhere.

Pag. ibid. They speak a great deal about *Stephen*, but the very same that was in their late Book, and no notice taken of my Answer to those Interrogatories; I refer you to my *Animadversions*.

Pag. 28. Parag. 1. They make themselves very much sport with the words *unseen and invisible*: they themselves were the occasion of that distinction, through their carping humour about this Quible; there is enough said in *Animadvers.* *Pag. 14.*

There is nothing but railing till *Pag. 29.* There is another harangue of words to as little purpose, *How this can be reconciled, that Christ should have a Manhood of an Earthly Substance, a Humane Natural Body, having the same matter, finiteness, shape it had on Earth, and yet the Word was made Flesh, as I confess*: So they put the Question, *Was the Word made an earthly Substance, a natural Body, a finite Creature? &c.*

Reply. The Word being made Flesh, is explained in *1 Tim. 3. 16.* *God was manifest in the Flesh*, God was manifest in a Humane natural Body, which was and is a finite Creature, we utterly deny any transmutation of one nature into another; but let it be noted, that by the *Quakers* bringing this Scripture here, who can but conceive that they do not believe that Christ had a real Humane natural Body when here on Earth, for then was the *Word made Flesh*. I ask, had he then an earthly, natural, finite Body and of a Humane shape? yet then was the Word made Flesh, but not one nature changed into another.

They ask in this *Parag.* *What prebeminence I allow Christ, if both his Essential parts be such finite Creatures, both his Soul and Body?*

Reply. I speak of both his Essential parts of the Manhood, they must of necessity be Creatures, else there were two Gods made in time: But the *Quakers* know that we believe Christ hath a divine Nature besides; they love to fight with Shadows.

They infer again. *If Christ's Body in Heaven be a natural Body, then it is a meaner Body than the Saints shall have, theirs shall be spiritual.*

Reply. Christ hath a glorious Body, and all the Saints shall have like Bodies, *Phil. 3. ult.* both his is, and theirs will be Spiritual, Heavenly, Glorious for qualities, yet the same substance remains, else they are not Bodies, but meer Spirits, and then cannot be the same they were on Earth.

When

When it's said in *Philippians*, *That our vile Bodies shall be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious Body*: The *Quakers* say, *We make no more of it than this, That we shall be fashioned like unto what we are, because we say, it is a Humane natural Body, &c.* as to substance.

Reply. We shall have a mighty change as to our Bodies in the Resurrection: There will be as vast a difference betwixt our Bodies now, and then, as betwixt a little Star and the Sun: but then it will be as to Qualities still, we shall have the same Bodies then as now for substance, earthly, natural, humane, else not the same. But this will not satisfy the *Quakers*, that the same Body shall be invested with more glory, as if Glory would not make a sufficient change, except the Substance be changed, which they here suppose. Nay, they speak it out plainly, *so the fashioning of the Body shall not be any change of the Substance.* Mark how it is spoke, the non-granting of this they would fasten upon me as an absurdity, *They say I have low thoughts of the glorious Body of Christ*, but will not the Reader say, you have low thoughts of Glory it self, that cannot be perswaded it will make a sufficient change in the Humane Body, except there be a Substantial change, (*i.e.*) that there remain no Body at all, and this destroys the resurrection of the Body.

At length we are come to the Authority that they quote, which is *Dr. Moor*: and pray by the way observe, these Men can give the title *Doctor* to this Man, yet deny it to *J. O.* or *T. G.* or any such, is not this respect of Persons? But may be its the error of the Printer, they would have me read his Book, stiled, *A Modest Inquiry into the Mystery of Iniquity.*

Reply. I have read it some years since, and my thoughts were then and are now the same, and they do agree with the apprehensions of many others, that *Dr. Moor* is very corrupt in Divinity, and in the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Heretical; for he denies the same numerical Body to rise. His notion is, that ἀνάστασις signifies nothing but a restating of the Man: so that if any new created Body be given, it is enough the Man is restated, this is Heresie. Let the *Quakers* read *Dr. Peirson* upon the *Creed*, what he hath writ upon the Resurrection, let one Doctor be set over against another. *Dr. Moor* hath many worthy enquiries in his Works, and I am glad in one respect that the *Quakers* will read him, in that I remember he hath very much in one of his Books against the *Familists*, and *Henry Nicolas* of *Amsterdam*, whose

whose Divinity, Religion, Sentiments, Opinions, Words, Phrases, do very much agree with the *Quakers*; but is this uprightness thinks the Reader, that these Men should plainly confess to the same Jesus that rose and ascended, to be in Being, and go about to make the People believe that they are for it, and are very angry with me for going about to detect them? still asserting it, and yet here quotes a Doctor that was plainly against the resurrection of the same Body. If we have not the same Body in the Resurrection, Jesus Christ had not, for there is *par ratio* both as to Head and Members; and if Christ had not, and hath not, he is not the same Mediator, nor Messiah, nor Saviour, but another. He suffered as to his Body, and that was crucified: now to have another, and not the same, will constitute him another Mediator, for he is Mediator according to both natures. Remember what the Scripture saith, that might silence this cursed Errour, 1 *Joh. 2. 1, 2. We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the Propitiation for our sins*: he that was and is a Propitiation which hath a respect to the offering of his Body, he is an Advocate, the same, not another, that never was a Propitiation. I shall not transcribe all Dr. Moor's words, neither do I intend to learn of him in this point, but of the Scripture, and there 1 *Cor. 15. I read in ver. 53, 54. Τὸ φθαρτὸν τέτο καὶ τὸ θνῆσκὸν τέτο, This corruptible put on incorruption, this mortal* τὸ and τέτο doth undoubtedly denote the same in number. I remember Dr. Moor is for Angels having Bodies, and here for Bodies becoming Angels, *the Bodies in the Resurrection may be dignified with these three titles, Angelical, Spiritual, Celestial*; if he means only as to qualities, it might better be born, but if as to substance, it is a lye. It's plain that Dr. Moor in a passage here quoted, manifests himself to be against the Resurrection of the same numerical Body, see his own words, *viz. that a glorified Body, or that Body whereby they shall be rewarded, who shall attain to that blessed Resurrection*. He speaks of another here, not the same, and that the giving of such a kind of Body is a reward to the Soul. Now, we understood that the reward was Glory and Immortality which was given to the whole Man constituted of Soul and Body; that the Body as well as Soul being united to Christ here, and made holy, and acting to the glory of God here, keeping the Commandments of God, should be rewarded, not annihilated, and another Body substituted in its room to be partaker of Glory, when as it was never employed, nor acted

acted with the Soul : but in this Dr. Moor and the Quakers agree not, at least in words, for Dr. Moor is for another Body of the same nature and kind, but more refined. Mark, he calls it *Flesh and Blood, but yet Celestial* : the Quakers are for the same Body in number, (as here they speak in this Book, *the same Jesus ascended that died and rose*) but yet not the same in kind and nature, changed into *Immensify*, that is, more then Angelical ; they would have the Soul in the Saints, which notion Dr. Moor would smile at, as beyond any of his, and which he did not so much as think of.

They advise me to read him upon this subject, as being a Man of far more wit and parts than my self.

Reply. I willingly acknowledg him so to be, and I profess my self willing to learn any thing of him, or of any other that is true and sound which the Scripture teacheth, and have received knowledg by his works. Let me again advise you to read what he hath writ against the *Familists*, and *Henry Nicolas*, whose Books I hear you often read : I look upon Dr. Moor to have more wit and parts than all the Quakers in England, yet I may not be of his mind in this matter, but say still he is herein very corrupt ; its well the Quakers apprehend Dr. Moor to be a Man of more wit and parts than any of themselves, for when they cannot answer me they produce his Writings to confute me, and would turn me off to him : I think he is a Man of such parts that he scorns to be guilty of such a broad face contradiction as this that the Quakers hold, *that the Body of Christ is the same in number, and yet not in kind and nature.*

Dr. Moor saith, *The Bodies that the Saints have in the Resurrection-state are the same in kind with those they had on Earth, the nature is more refined, it is flesh, but not terrestrial.* But the Quakers say, it is the very self-same Body that was born of the Virgin, yet changed as to Substance, the Soul turned into Immensity. Now, this is rank nonsense, it is as if you should speak thus to any concerning other things : it is not Fish, but changed, yet it is the same Fish that was caught : it is not Flesh, but changed in its nature and substance, yet the same Flesh that was boyled or roasted. How can it be the same in number, if not in kind and nature ? this Humane nature, if not Humane nature ? I challenge you all to answer that Argument, that you say is *not universally true*, Pag. 30. Parag. 3. *in all respects*, but gives not one instance to shew the fulness

fallencess of it. How can he be this Man Jesus Christ, if he be not a Man at all? silenced here they be, but will not yield.

Pag. 30, 31. *They upbraide me with Ignorance, in asserting that Christ Jesus hath the same Humane form, figure, shape, that he had on Earth.*

Reply. Yet in the abundance of their Knowledg and Light they have not told me what form, figure, or shape the Humane Body hath, whether of an Angel. Indeed Dr. Moor saith, the Body is Angelical in the other state: but what say the *Quakers* to this, I yet hear not. Any other shape of any other Creature is too inferior; is it the form of the Son? what is it?

But they think they have got something to urge upon me strongly from that they had in their last, *viz. That Christ, Mark 16. 12. appeared in another form. Then according to our reasoning his Being must be changed; but this is absurd they say.*

Reply. We say he did not really appear in another form.

But doth not the Scripture express it in so many words?

Reply. But Luke interprets it, *Luk. 24. 16.* and saith, *their eyes were held, that they should not know him,* therefore he was the very same: he speaks this, *viz. of appearing in another form, only as to outward appearance, the countenance, habit, form, did not seem to them as before.*

But then they say Mark and Luke contradict one another.

Reply. So they had indeed in downright language, if nothing more had been in the History than that *Mark* should say, he appeared in another form, and *Luke* should say (as the *Quakers* bring him in from some of my words) that Jesus Christ was the same, appeared in the same form and figure; what should be the reason that the *Quakers* should be thus fallacious? They love to make the Scripture fight with it self, that in the mean while they might run away with their idle Dreams: why did they not mention *vers. 16. of 24. Luke* in all this? Were the *Quakers* eyes held think you, that they could not read this, nor take any notice of it? do the Scriptures appear in another form to them than to any sort of People besides? what is the matter?

At length Pag. 31. they are come to treat on that Scripture, *Joh. 20. 19, 20. viz. Christ appearing to his Disciples, the doors being shut.* They say now, they only brought this Scripture to stop my intruding into unseen things, and that I do not well in fastning this upon them, *viz. that they brought it to prove that Christ penetrated the doors.*

Reply. Look into their Book, and you will plainly see, that this Scripture is brought for this end, to let all see that I was ignorant in asserting the Manhood of Christ had the same form and figure that it had on Earth, in that it came in among the Disciples the door being shut: Now, what else could they aim at hereby, but that the form of the Body must be so changed, that it must penetrate the Doors or Walls? let the Reader judge of this. We believe no such thing, for it would utterly destroy the nature of a Body, and this we dare plainly speak and say, therefore there was a miracle wrought, (*i. e.*) Christ caused the Doors to open of their own accord, as it was in Peter's coming out of Prison. Now observe, the *Quakers* do not yet say how Christ came in, the Doors being shut, but leave it still in silence, with this reserve, that the Body might be so changed into a Spirit that it might penetrate Doors and Walls: be sure then the nature and substance of the Body was gone, and it could not be the same but another Jesus, (*i. e.*) a Spirit altogether, which he said, his Body, his Flesh and Bones were not upon his Resurrection, *Luk. 24. 39.* And thus there was no need at all for Christ to work any Miracle, causing the Doors to open on their own accord: for a Spirit can penetrate Wood, Iron, Stone in an ordinary way at any time. O that we had to do with a plain hearted People!

Pag. 32. They bring my Conclusions, which manifest what a strange Manhood they have confess'd to; five of them you may read there, and then cry out of wrong Perversion, confounding their words, and say, I have not distinguished what I mean by Manhood, whether the Body, or Spirit of Christ, or both?

Reply. Whether I have wronged them a tittle or no, I will stand to the judgment of any understanding impartial Reader, and that I have not distinguished what I mean by Manhood, is a notorious lye. In *Pag. 3.* of the *Antidote*, I write that Man consists of two Essential parts, Soul and Body, both these Christ had, for which I quote *Heb. 10. 3. Luk. 24. 39. Matth. 26. 28.* and afterward I prove plainly, that both these are in Heaven, I know no other Manhood than this. See what conscience these Men have, to say, I have not distinguished what I mean by Manhood; this is like that in their last Book, when they said, *I brought objections against them of my own framing, which objections, all save one, (and that was known to all to be the Quakers) I found in that same Book of theirs. What no shame left?*

Page 32. In a way of retaliation they here enumerate the consequences of my carnal conceits, (as they call them,) which yet are according to Scripture, and the best reformed Churches, shewing what a strange Christ I have set forth: the consequences are but two at present, by the next it's like ye may have more invented. 1. That Christ being wholly in the highest Heaven, and his Body there, more bright than a thousand Suns, yet cannot be seen by any Prospective Glasses, he must needs be at a wonderful distance from his Saints on Earth.

Reply. That Christ is wholly in the highest Heaven, let them dare to deny; that he is so wholly there, as not to be here on Earth by the Spirit of the Godhead, is so gross a thing to fasten upon me, that they themselves in this Book have again and again cleared me, and openly acknowledged that I confess to his Spiritual presence on Earth: so then, all the consequence amounts but to this, that the Humane Body of Christ is at such a vast distance from the Saints on Earth, that in an ordinary way it cannot be seen by what Prospective Glasses soever, though it be so bright and glorious; yet if God pleases in an extraordinary way to strengthen the eye of any Saint, as he did *Stephens*, opening the Heavens, removing out of the way what may hinder the sight, it may easily be seen. Now, what absurdity is in this, when as the supream Heaven is at that vast distance from the starry Heaven? let them remember what Christ said, *I leave the World, I go away, ye shall see me no more.*

John 16. 28.

John 14. 28.

Conseq. 2. That his Soul is bound up in that Body at that vast height, that it cannot so much as extend to any Saint on Earth, to visit and comfort them in their tryals.

Reply. Here they are at their ridiculous notion again; indeed so ridiculous a notion, that if they did not joyn the word Spirit to Soul as a blind, School-Boys would laugh at them: What? the Humane Soul of Christ come from Heaven to the Saints on Earth, to visit them and comfort them? if it comes, then either it must leave the Body, and then there is nothing but a dead Body in Heaven, else the Body must come along with it; then that Scripture is false, *whom the Heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things*; for there is no Mediator, no Christ Jesus there.

Or thirdly, It must be extended from the Body in Heaven to the Saints on Earth; which last they seem to intimate here, for they have that very word *extend*: then the Soul once a Creature is be-

come a God; for to be immense is to be a God, and then there was a new God made in time. I require a punctual answer to this. *But if not so, that the Soul of Christ cannot visit the Saints on Earth to comfort them, then Satan hath more power to come to tempt than Christ to comfort; and this is sad news they say.*

Reply. Christ doth come by his Spiritual presence, and that is enough to the Saints, till a farther dispensation of his local coming, and this doth comfort them in their tryals thus to come as the Son of God; as the Son of Man he doth not come till he comes the *second time without sin to Salvation*; so that inference they make here is a downright lye, that Satan hath more power to come to tempt than Christ to comfort. Satan is not yet bound up as he will be hereafter, it is the Will of God that he should yet be here on Earth to tempt the Saints, but it is not the Will of God that the Humane Nature of Christ should be on Earth as yet, but that the Heaven should *contain it until the restitution of all things*, and we see not yet all things restored. If Gods Will was that Satan should remain bound up in Hell, though an Angel, yet being but a Creature he could not tempt us on Earth: The Humane Nature of Christ is but a Creature, if God will have it limited to Heaven, it cannot be there and on Earth at once.

All the rest of that Paragraph is answered before, it's but the same over again; there is only one passage in it, and then we will dismiss it, *viz. and the Spirit of Life that he breaths in*, and then speaks of *Christ spiritually formed in the Saints*.

Reply. By these Passages, and what Discourses have sometimes been betwixt some *Quakers* and others, I am jealous and not without ground, that their opinion is, that when God breathed into *Adam* the breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul, (the which thing is done to every one of Mankind) that this is the forming of Christ in every Man, this is the Seed of the new Birth; either the Soul it self, or something in the Soul which they call part of God, of the Holy Ghost, they call it Christ, and some of them a measure of Christ. *Smith* saith, *All power in Heaven and Earth is in it*. Pray intreat them when they write next to explain themselves, and not be ashamed of their notion.

Pag. 33, 34. There is a large confession in good Scripture words, I only query two or three things from some Passages in it.

1. They say, *That Christ was made of the seed of David according to the Flesh.* *Quer.* Whether it was not the seed of David according

according to the Flesh, that not only died, but rose again, and ascended, and is now in Being in Heaven? Whether the *Quakers* cannot say that Jesus Christ is now the seed of *David* according to the Flesh? Whether the Light within every Man may be said to be the seed of *David* according to the Flesh? I remember one of *G. Fox's* Interpretations, that when it's said he took upon him the seed of *Abraham*, that seed was the Light within.

2. They say Pag. 34. *His Soul was capable of sorrow for Mankind.*

Reply. That doth testify it was truly Humane: Now, how that Soul that was capable of sorrow can be turned into an immense Deity, to be extended from Heaven to Earth, let them tell us.

3. *So that the true Christ is neither divided.*

Reply. Must we not speak distinctly of his Natures, Humane, Divine, as the Scripture doth, *Col. 2. 9. In him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily?* That *Him* must be something of a distinct consideration from the Godhead, *Heb. 9. 14. Who through the eternal Spirit offered himself;* that *Himself* is distinguished from the eternal Spirit. Remember this that the *Quakers* are for a confusion and transmutation of the natures one into another, which is a grand error.

4. Say they, *Neither must we entertain such low, mean, carnal thoughts of the Son of God.*

Reply. We must not forget notwithstanding, but own it and acknowledg it with thankfulness, that which the *Quakers* make mention of in this their confession, that this Christ the Son of God took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness or habit of Men, and being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death: which form, fashion, habit of a Man, of a Servant, we say he still wears, and contend for this against the *Quakers*, which say he hath put it off. Pray let the Reader mind that in this Confession of Faith, and others, the *Quakers* avoid the Scriptures that speak of his death for Sin, his making himself an Offering and a Sacrifice for Sin. They are ashamed of Christ's Cross. They are against Christ's making satisfaction to Divine Justice for Man's Sin, by bearing that punishment that Man should have born. In this Book, remember Pag 10. They scoff at this Truth, jeer at me for asserting it. They say in their Books, he offered up himself a Sacrifice in us, the Light within

within that Body was crucified. They say here, his Soul was capable of Sorrow and Affliction for Mankind, and sympathized with us, but not a word of his bearing any thing from God the Father, in suffering what he did in our room and stead. I wish ye did but all know this one thing of the *Quakers*, and that once they would put out professedly a Confession of their Faith, that they might be manifest: If it were but well considered by the People this thing, what Enemies they are to the Cross of Christ, to the great Doctrine of the Propitiation, without the Faith of which we cannot be Christians, they would be so far from hearing them, that they would not Eat or Drink or keep Company with them, but abhor their Society as of a *Jew, Turk, or Heathen*.

Pag. 35. *If he be minded to busie himself with an Answer, and thereby put his Hearers to farther charge with his Books.*

Reply. The People and Hearers are ready to witness that they have hitherto been at no charge with my Books, but only the buying of them at a Penny a Sheet: who is at the charge of printing the *Quakers* Books think you? I had not known but that I am now informed by one that was many years a *Quaker*, and is now for ought I know, for he hath their Tenents as they held them at the first rise, *Jeffery Bullock* of *Sadbury*, in a Book lately printed, stiled, *Antichrists Transformation within, discovered by the Light within*. Pag. 4. He saith that the *Quakers* Books are imposed upon Friends, and that they are paid for out of the collection of the Money that is gathered for the relief of the Poor. So he saith the *English* Proverb is made good, *The Poor pays for all*.

They further say, *We would advise him to consult with some of his learned Brethren that they might view his Work before it go to Press.*

Reply. Without any of your advice the Notes of my *Antidote* were viewed by one learned in Christs School, and I had his approbation; he did judg it all sound, and encouraged me to print it; that is the ground-work at which you have levelled all the Batteries of your Malice, and I am still defending it; you may well say that you have all this while waged War, not only with single *W. H.* but with all the *Independent* Party in *England*, and with that Doctrine they all own, and therefore may hear more about it. I will give you the Doctrine of all the *Independent* Party in their Declaration from the *Savoy*, of their Faith and Order owned and practised by their Churches.

Chap. 8. Of Christ the Mediator, Head 2. The Son of God,
 the second Person in the Trinity being very and eternal God,
 of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness
 of time was come, take upon him Mans nature, with all the
 Essential Properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without
 sin, being conceived by the Power of the Holy Ghost in the Womb
 of the Virgin Mary, of her substance: So that two whole perfect and
 distinct natures, the Godhead and the Manhood, were inseparably
 joyned together in one Person, without conversion, composition,
 or confusion. Which Person is very God and very Man, yet one
 Christ the only Mediator betwixt God and Man. Head 4. On the
 third day he arose from the Dead with the same Body in which he
 suffered, with which also he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth
 at the right hand of his Father making Intercession, and shall re-
 turn to judg Men and Angels at the end of the World. Head 7.
 Christ in the work of Mediation acteth according to both natures,
 by each nature doing that which is proper to it self, yet by reason
 of the unity of the Person, that which is proper to one nature is
 sometimes in Scripture attributed to the Person denominated by
 the other nature. Here is enough to let the Reader see that I
 plead for nothing but what all the Congregational Churches in
 England own, and in opposing me and this Doctrine, they do op-
 pose all the Independents in England, and I therefore need not fear
 but I shall have their Prayers and Incouragement to stand by me
 in Christ's cause; and this let me say to the Quakers concerning
 their Books, having given their verdict of mine, If your Clergy at
 Devonshire House, your Presbyterian Classical Church there, do blot
 out all the Impertinencies, Absurdities, Contradictions in your
 Notes before they are printed, your Poor would fare the better by
 their Collections, for we should then have no Books at all.

You may read what they say of my Absurdities and Self-contradictions in Pag. 35. They gravely advise me in the same Page to stay and forbear writing till John Crook's Book come out, which is stiled, The Counterfeit Convert.

Reply. I have been told of this mighty Book a long while, when will the Mountains bring forth the Mouse! I have sufficient experience of John Crook's impertinent scribbling, and of his juggling and equivocating beyond others of you; that is he that rides about with our Watchword in his mouth, our Colours in his hand, he that doth most of all transform himself as a Minister of Christ. I have said

said the Creature that is likest a Man, and yet no Man, is the ugliest of all. There is a Lad at *Ware*, (for so you call him) a Strippling that will engage this *Goliab* that doth thus defy the Armies of *Israel* with his mighty Spear, like a Weavers Beam: when the Counterfeit comes he will be found able to pull the Hood off and unmask him, and vindicate himself from him and them, that will neither go in themselves, nor suffer others to enter.

Pag. 36. They are come to the sentence that *Baily* pronounced in the hearing of many at *Hartford*. They say now it was conditional, viz. *If I did not repent* (and this is added also, and foisted in by them) *I should die mad*. Now to put it out of doubt, read what follows.

WE whose names are subscribed, do testify, that we heard *William Baily* pronounce this Sentence against *William Haworth* in *John Smart's* House at *Hartford*, *I declare from the Lord, Thou shalt be Mad, thou shalt be Distracted, yea, deprived of thy Wits*. When some of us desired of him to shew us the time when it would be, we had no answer from him, or any other, when the time would be.

Will. Bennet, senior.

Will. Bennet, junior.

Will. Barfoot.

Nicholas Tuffnel.

Pag. 36. They say that *this is come to pass already, as appears by my writing, the inconsistencies in them manifest that I am a crazed Man*.

Reply. Jesus Christ, whose Cause I am pleading, through his Grace will enable me to bear your reproach, and turn it for my good, and judg betwixt you and me. The Master was said to be mad, and to have a Devil: *Paul* was called a Babler. I leave the Reader to judg whether I write so inconsistently; only remember this, which is enough to give you a stand, that all the Godly in the Nation have judged your Party ever since they came forth,

to be in a Spiritual Frenzy, acted by a Diabolical Spirit, witness your naked Women in Streets and Assemblies, your *Naylor's* riding at *Bristol*, your *Parnel's* fasting, your frenzical tricks all over the Nation: Will you provoke us to print again the famous Story of *Gilpin* at *Kendal*, that was several times possessed by the Devil, and the mad tricks he did there, wallowing in the Mire of the Streets; attested by the Mayor and Aldermen of *Kendal*? Hear *Dr. Owen's* judgment of you, in his discourse concerning the Holy Spirit, *Book 1. Chap. 1. Pag. 19.* 'There is in the days
' wherein we live an Antispirit set up, and advanced against the
' Spirit of God, in his Being, and all his Operations, in his whole
' work and use towards the Church of God, for this new Spirit
' takes upon him whatever is promised to be effected by the good
' Spirit of God: This is that which some Men call the *Light with-*
' *in them*, though indeed it be nothing but a dark product of *Satan*
' upon their own Imaginations, or at best the natural Light of Con-
' science, which some of the Heathens also called a Spirit; but here-
' unto do they trust as that which doth all for them, leaving no
' room for the promise of the Spirit of God, nor any thing for him
' to do: This teacheth them, instructs them, enlightens them,
' to this they attend as the *Samaritans* to *Simon Magus*, and as
' they say, yield obedience to it; and from hence with the fruits
' of it do they expect acceptation with God, Justification and
' Blessedness hereafter. He goeth on, but it's too long to transcribe
' all his words; If they say this Light is the Spirit, it will be easie
' to demonstrate how by their so saying they utterly destroy the
' very Nature and Being of the Holy Ghost; and if they say it is
' not the Holy Spirit of God, it will be no less manifest that they
' utterly exclude him on the other side from his whole work, and
' substitute another, yea, an Enemy in his room; for another God
' is a false God, another Christ is a false Christ, another Spirit is
' a false Spirit, the Spirit of Antichrist. Thus far he. *Repent*
therefore of your wickedness, and pray if perhaps the thoughts of your
hearts may be forgiven, for we do clearly see you are in the gall of
bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.

Pag. 37. They say my madness is not like that madness that
Festus attributed to Paul, but like that Paul had against the Chri-
stians before he was converted.

Reply. I never haled any of them yet out of their Meetings to
G Prison,

Prison, it is only in Writing and Preaching, and this they have done against me: Now, whether I or they be in the truth, let Jesus Christ judg. Was not that madness in the persecuting Spirit, when the *Quakers* ran into the Assemblies and railed at the best Ministers that ever *England* had? I confess they are of late more civil and sober, and better manner'd, in that they do not disturb the *Episcopal* Clergy. That which they speak in their hot zeal for their great Goddess *Diana* the Light within, is answered in my Book against *Baily* and *Crook*, Pag. 82, 83. Pray read and be established. There are two very remarkable things concerning the Light, before that Paragraph is closed.

Pag. 38. Lin. 2. *We affirm, that whosoever embraces it and obeys it in the Faith, shall come to have that nature changed, by which they were once Children of Wrath, to be made Partakers of the divine Nature.*

Reply. Here is the musty four Leaven of Errour many hundred years old of *Pelagius*. Note, the *Quakers* speak of Faith before a change of Nature: must not this be a goodly natural Faith? can there be operation before life, an act before an habit? Regeneration in order of nature is before any act of Faith; a Body must have life before it can act, a Tree must have root and sap before any Fruit. Union with Christ the true Vine is the first thing of all, *John 15: severed from me ye can do nothing.* See the *Quakers* Divinity, one Errour begets another; would it be proper to say to a dead Man, if thou wilt walk and eat and drink, thou mayst have life?

Pag. *ibid.* *The divine Nature which the Apostle Peter mentions, 2 Pet. 1. 4. and that is the nature whereby the things contained in the Law are truly done. Rom. 2. 14, 15. they did by nature things contained in the Law.*

Reply. I never read any place of Scripture abused by either *Arminian* or *Socinian* at that rate that this Scripture is by the *Quakers*, and this is the first time that ever I heard this asserted. What will not a scared Conscience say to establish a rotten Opinion once espoused, *viz.* That the nature by which the Gentiles did things contained in the Law, was the divine Nature; of whom the same Apostle in the same Epistle next Chapter saith, *that they were unrighteous, no fear of God before their eyes, under sin, fallen short of the Glory of God.* Is not this horrible? They slyly add this word **TRULY**, are truly done: things contained in the Law are truly done

done by them that partake of the divine Nature, and only by them; but they apply this to the Gentiles, for that Scripture speaks of them. If they were made Partakers of the divine Nature, then all Men are, for these were the worst sort in the World, *serving dumb Idols, and sacrificing to Devils*, as the Scripture speaks, for these two are opposed each to other, and do *tollere se invicem*, according to the *Quakers*, he that is Partaker of the divine Nature is no longer a Child of Wrath by the other Nature. Here is Divinity from *Hartford*.

Pag. 38. Parag. 2. They say *they will pass over much of my incongruous confused matter, &c.*

Reply. I desire the diligent observant Reader to compare this their Book with mine, and he will see there is many a thing in it that they give not a word of answer to, which stands firm against them, and they dare not meddle with. In Pag. 7. to what I quote out of *Smith* against them, not a word. To what I say in Pag. 10. against the Soul of Christ coming from Heaven, not any thing to take it off. In Pag. 12. in clearing our Opinion from the *Anthropomorphits* which they charged me with, nothing but silence. To that which I made appear was false, that they said I made objections of my own against them, finding them in their own Book; they stand guilty, are proved Lyars, not any thing to that throughout my Book. That lye that they told of me in their Book, how I should say that there was no more in *Stephen's* seeing Christ than what was natural; this they stand charged withall, Pag. 14. and are silent to it: and what is spoken of *Stephen*, that the ground of seeing Christ at the right hand of God, was his being full of the Holy Ghost; and about *John's* seeing one like the Son of Man among the Golden Candlesticks, what their thoughts of these are, amounts to no more than seeing Christ the Light in a Mans own heart, not any reply. Pag. 15. To that passage in *Luk. 24. 15.* of the Disciples eyes being held, and likewise that objection they brought in their last, of Christ not having the same form, in that *Mary* did not know him, which I answered, Pag. 17. no reply. About Christ's Manhood being worshipped, which they cavil at, and said it was unscriptural language, and I prove it from Scripture, Pag. 18. not so much as any thing endeavoured to take it off. As to the Intercession of Christ how their Opinion wholly denies it, Pag. 19. not any thing. The 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28,

and part of the 29. to what I say about Justification by Faith alone in the imputed Righteousness against inherent Righteousness as the matter of Justification, they are wholly silent. As to the last, *viz.* The mischief their Doctrine doth to the Christian Religion, not a word. So that I require another Book to answer my *Animadversions*, or else a confession that they are not able. Truth is too strong for them, or a Retraction, that they were unadvised in what they writ, else the Reader cannot but in judgment give it on my side. Withall, I appeal to the Reader if in any of their Books that I have undertaken an Answer there be any material thing that I have not touched upon; and whether my answers be *ad rem*, I leave it to his judgment.

After they have passed all this over, that they know not how to write any thing against, they are come to that which they have something to *Pag. 38. concerning the People of Hartfords perswading me to be quiet, and say that I have stirred up much discord since I came thither; they were much quieter, Neighbour with Neighbour, and more friendly before I came.*

Reply. I am for Peace, that is with Truth, or else it is not Gods Peace, but the Devils Peace; *as much as in you lies live peaceably with all Men*, the Scripture teacheth us; but its not possible, if those we live with endeavour to corrupt Religion. There were always uproars where the Gospel came, because of the unbelief of Mens hearts, and their enmity against it. *Paul* was one, where ever he came, that turned the World upside down; and Christ himself said, he came to send Fire and Sword, and to set one against another, even those that were near Relations: You know what I said in my last, What Peace, while the Whoredomes continue? its high time (if Gods will was so) that your Nest at *Hartford* was broke up, no other way than by a constant writing and disputing against your Errors, whereby your own souls are poysoned, and you have poysoned many of the Inhabitants of that Town: may but you quietly carry on your Trades, and by degrees grow rich, and propagate the Leaven of your Doctrine, is your interest: but ours is to *withstand you to the face, and not to give place to you, no not for an hour, that the Truth of the Gospel may continue in the Town.*

Gal. 2. 5.

Pag. 38. Parag. ibid. That he was suspected by some of his own Hearers to be very like the Quakers, even so much, that he was said

to preach their Principles. They go on thus, adding, that surely if I would but confess, I was then in a better condition than now.

Reply. Here is one of their Colworts, sodden at least the fourth or fifth time over, repeated frequently by them. If my Hearers so much suspected me, it was for want of good and sound judgment to discern things aright; who ever heard me preach such things as these, viz. The Doctrine of imputed Righteousness was a Doctrine of Devils; this *Pen* hath writ. That all Power in Heaven and Earth is in that Light that every Man hath; that if Man will obey it, it will pardon their sins, and change their nature; this another hath writ. That *G. Fox* is the Father of many Nations, and all must call him blessed; This another *Quaker* hath writ. That the Man Christ is in every Female Speaker; *G. Fox*. That outward Blood cleanseth not; that Heavenly Flesh and Bones came down from Heaven and tabernacled in that Body that was taken of the Virgin, and that was the Christ; *Pennington* saith this. The Light in that Body that was taken of the Virgin is the Christ; that the Scripture is not the rule; that Ordinances of the Gospel are vain and ceased, this *W. Pen* lately. Another hath, that Christ was offered within us, and suffered, and was sacrificed within us. Lately, that it was the Devil that suffered without the Gates, &c. That *Mary* was a Whore, and Christ a Bastard, *James Naylor* said at *York*. These are the *Quakers* Doctrines. If you would see more, but here are enough to turn any one Christians Stomack, read *Mr. Faldoes*, where you have Book and Page quoted; if any at *Hartford* will prove that they ever heard me preach such nauseous blasphemous stuff as this, I will then preach no more. As for my condition, I had been in a very ill condition surely if I had preached such Doctrine, I should have been in a scared, deluded condition, in the snare of the Devil, and had deserved to have been dealt with (in case that Law should now take place) as a Blasphemer, (i. e.) be stoned to death; my condition now could not have been worse. This I can say, (through Gods Grace) my condition is now much better than it was when I came first to *Hartford*, not in reference to wordly matters (although the *Quakers* upbraid me much with my Gifts I have there received) but in that through the inlightning of the Spirit I can now better discern Truth from the *Quakers* Errours.

*This Smith in
his Primer.*

They

They tell us in the next place that I have been wont to say, I have been ten times a Quaker: which if true, then I shew my Apostacy and uncertainty the more, and am not to be trusted.

Reply. I confess I have frequently said this to the Quakers; but then it is usually in answer to them, when they in a boasting way tell us on purpose to stagger the People, they have been Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptists, Seekers, one after another: Now, why may not we have leave to say these Quakers have the more declared their apostacy from the Truth, and their uncertainty? And which of those five sorts of Christians dare trust them any farther than they are constrained, looking upon them as a company of Cheats, that design a Party among the ignorant sort of People, for their own ends, to have a Kingdom and Commonwealth within themselves, to enrich one another? And now for me to be an Apostate from this Sect, is to fall from Darkness to Light, from Satan to God, from Nature to Grace, from Hell to Heaven. If you will have me speak plainly what I mean when I have frequently spoke these words, I will tell you heartily: When any Temptation hath come from Satan, and my own remaining Ignorance and Unbelief, and there hath been any yielding thereunto to draw me from the Doctrine of Satisfaction of Divine Justice for the Sin of Man by the sufferings of Jesus Christ, to that cursed first-born Errour of the Devil, Socinianism; denying this, then I have counted my self to be turning Quaker, and so far as it prevailed, and as long a Quaker, for this is Quakerism; When from Justification by Faith alone in imputed Righteousness, to the blind Popish Errour of works and inherent Righteousness, then a Quaker, for that is part of Quakerism; From Election and free special Grace, to common universal Grace and Redemption with the Arminian, then a Quaker, for that is the Quakers Tenet and Opinion; If from the Truth, the great fundamental Truth of the Resurrection of one and the same Body, to the Saducees Errour, this is Quakerism, then a Quaker; or with Hymeneus and Philetus, to say it's past already, in that Christ is risen in the new Birth, then a Quaker: Yet in so many times as I speak of, I never had the temptation to this Errour newly broached by the Quakers concerning the Manhood of Christ, viz. That the Soul of Christ was in every Saint, and the Body changed as to Substance, and yet the same Jesus that died, and rose,

rose, ascended, and is in Heaven a place : because it is such a perfect contradiction and nonsense, that I must then be indeed as the *Quakers* suppose me to be now, crazed and mad, or else in one of their Extasies, which is all one, out of my Wits.

Pag. 38. *They say, the main thing that troubles me, is, that the Quakers should go about to perswade my Hearers to give me no more Money, and exercise their Wits about a Comparison I used to answer them withall, viz. Could any perswade the Dutch to be quiet, and give their Souldiers no more Pay, the King of France had done his work. So this Money, say they, is the sinew of War, take away that and the service would cease; they go on it seems, that Money is the sinews of his Cause, take away this and his service would cease.* And p. 39. more of this, *In all this he will not say that Money is not a moving cause to maintain his Preaching, for he knows that if the Money be taken away, let who will preach to his Christians at Hartford.*

Reply. I am not troubled in the fear of the loss of the Money, but it doth trouble me, and would any, to see that envious, peevish, malicious, yea absurd, and unreasonable Spirit of these Men manifested very much against me in this matter, in abundance of perverse words. I can say (through the grace of God) and do appeal to the People themselves in this matter, that I have not behaved my self so greedy of filthy Lucre among them, as the *Quakers* would represent me to be; and I know, that when they read these Lines they will plainly perceive the Satanical Spirit in them, thus falsely to go about to accuse me. But how these Men forget themselves, for while they think themselves witty in scoffing at my Comparison, they fall foul upon the Scripture it self, and abuse it. My Comparison is grounded upon 1 Cor. 9. 7. *Who goeth a Warfare any time at his own charge?* How now *Quaker*, will you say then, be like *Paul*? You will have your Money to be the sinews of the cause of your Gospel-Ministry; for it is the sinews of War: and you compare your Ministry to a Warfare, your Ministers *Paul* then will cease when the Money ceases. *Paul* would have answered, yea, it is so *Quaker*; Money is the sinew of War; the most necessary, spiritual, lawful War in the World cannot be carried on without it, no food, no necessaries without it: and would you not have the Gospel Christian Ministers I speak of, have food and raiment? if this be not some way administred, their service.

service must cease, unless they had such a faculty of fasting as *Parnel* had, for fourteen or fifteen days together: we might do some service in that time, but our service would soon cease as his did. I desire the *Quakers* would think on that last Scripture, and give me leave to tell them, that though I am no Souldier for Christ to them in this Warfare, yet I am to our own People; then the Apostle allows that my charge should be born, and I may require it, and demand it, though this I do not, nor ever did; but what is done for me, is chearfully, freely and voluntarily done. And may not a Souldier have higher ends than his Wages, while he doth deserve them, and lawfully takes them? Whether it be so with me, I leave it to the great Judg, and will farther say, could you obtain your end in this one thing by your wicked insinuations, to take the People off their contributing to me, yet ye would be frustrated in the other, my service (through God's grace) should not cease, nor be in the least diminished, I would labour with my hands for Bread, and preach the Gospel against your Errours. The *Quakers* are much troubled that the Saints will give us that which Christ hath commanded them, *Matth. 10. 10. The Workman is worthy of his hire*; if I am not a Workman to you, I am to some; Are you angry that we have Meat ministred to us? what an inhumane barbarous thing is this? here you rebel against your own Light of Nature: *Shall he that planteth a Vineyard, not eat of the Fruit? Shall a man feed a Flock and not eat of the Milk?* I am not yet chargeable and burdensome to your Flocks, or to any of them: forgive me this wrong, and let me be answered; have your Ministers no way any maintenance? then either they have Estates of their own sufficient, and then they have no need. It is so with some of our Ministry, who are as free in preaching as you can be: or else they work and labour for their Bread; and if thus, more selfish and covetous are your People, and walk in disobedience to the Command of Christ. Collections we hear you have among your Party all over *England*, and let this now be honestly answered by any of those that have apostatized from us to you (if they are but those that have it to contribute:) if it doth not cost them more by the Year in Collections than it did among us? And what becomes of all this? is it only disbursed among the Poor? then they fare well: and no wonder so many comes in to you and turns *Quakers* for the Loaves; Or is some of it laid out in printing your Books, and
none

none of it upon your poor Ministers? are there none such among you? was it ever known that any sort of People whatever to have a Ministry among them and no Maintenance?

Pag. 39. *It's well known (say they) that our Religion is not propagated by Money.*

Reply. It's known now throughout the whole Nation to them that are not quite blind, that the *Quakers* do profelyte many to them by promises of help in their Trade and Commerce by the loan of Money. And do not provoke by your continual waspishness, lest I give you Instances by name that you have tempted to your way by the promises of temporal rewards, I had it from the Persons own mouth lately, and she is to be credited; the *Quakers* told her, that if she would forsake the Gifts of others, and own their way only in opposition to others, she should never want, they would provide for her all her days: Words to this purpose. And this is not the first time of their tempting her in this kind.

In the close of all, they speak of my upbraiding the People of Hartford, in being so apt to be ensnared with the *Quakers* in reference to gain a Trade in the World: They say I am angry with them that they are not so malicious against the *Quakers* as myself, or that they abate in their gifts and rewards to me, and that they should caution me that I should not revile the *Quakers* and covet after Money, Gifts and Rewards, till I become burdensome, hoping in time that the People will grow weary of the charge and burden that I put them to, to this purpose.

Reply. I do appeal to the Lord, that in all I have said or writ against the *Quakers*, it is not malice against their Persons that hath acted me, but zeal for the Truth against their filthy Errours, which my Soul loathes, abhors, detests, and to which I shall be an utter enemy as long as I live in the World, being assured that it is another Gospel of another Jesus that they are introducing by another Spirit; then cannot I be said to be angry that my Hearers are not so malicious as myself: no, but that some of them are so weak in judgment as not clearly to discern their Errours from the Truth, and that they have not flaming zeal against them. That some of the Town have been so much like *Demas* that forsook *Paul*, embracing this present World in hope of some help in their Trade and Commerce. I can truly say I find no abatement in the Peoples love and affections: as to their gifts and rewards I never yet sought them,

they are my Witnesſes. If they ſhould altogether keep them to themſelves, I ſhall for Chriſts ſake ſerve them as long as I can by any lawful way have Bread to eat. All the gifts and rewards that yet I have had of them have not made me rich; yet ſome of the *Quakers* Preachers are enriched in their Miniſtry, with whom I can make compariſon as to frugality in Meat and Apparel: how comes this to paſs, when as they neither had Eſtates by inheritance or donation, nor yet obtained it by their trading: do theſe grow rich miraculoſly? You may read the *Quakers Quibbles*, there you will ſee it ingenuouſly proved, that the *Quakers* have no Miracles among them. In fine, pray take notice that the rankeſt Jeſuite at Rome could not have more wicked inſinuations than theſe *Quakers* here to take the People off their duty to Non-conformiſts, who theſe fifteen Years have been deprived of that publick maintenance that was once allowed them, and we and our Families reduced to many ſtraits, having not been educated in Trades as others, yet conſtrained to intangle our ſelves with thoſe affairs which a Miniſter ought to be free from. See how we ſhould fare if ever theſe Men ſhould have power in their hands. The *Romaniſts* and the *Quakers* are friends alike to us, the *Independent* Non-conformiſts. Thus we ſee they are vexed at their hearts that the People are kind and loving to us, which is a token of the increaſe of Chriſts Kingdom among the People, and this they ſay and write in carnal policy to take the People off from us, that they might affect them and contribute to their quarterly Collections, that their Money being there augmented, they might have the more to print their Books, maintain their Miniſtry, and buy their Proſelytes.

F I N I S.

Errata.

Pag. 3. l. 20. dele words. p. 5. l. 5. r. *their*. p. 7. l. 24. r. *for neither, and not*. p. 8. l. 34. r. *Dact. II. look and you will ſee*. p. *ibid.* l. *ibid.* r. *contradicting*. p. 11. l. 11. r. *thou diſt not*. p. 16. l. 9. r. *[upon that] without a Comma*. p. *ibid.* penult. r. *[before] without a Comma*. p. 29. l. 7. r. *[humour] without a Colon, and quible without a Comma*. p. 33. l. 11. *for Son, & r. Sun*. I ſhall refer *Mary Stout* to the future Answer, which e're long will be published to *John Crook's* late Book, which will comprehend all that I need ſay to her, the ſubject matter in her Epistle being much one and the ſame with that in his Book, neither my time nor purſe will give me leave to print particular Answers to the Man ſpeaking both in the Male and in the Female.